The sGG Class of Compact Complex Manifolds

Dan Popovici and Luis Ugarte

arXiv:1407.5070v1 [math.DG] 18 Jul 2014

Abstract. We study the compact complex manifolds whose Gauduchon cone coincides with the (a priori smaller) strongly Gauduchon (sG) cone and give numerical characterisations of sGG manifolds defined in this way involving certain Hodge, Bott-Chern and Betti numbers, one of which is $b_1 = 2h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}$ which makes them Kähler-surface-like. As this class of manifolds contains the class of $\partial\bar\partial$-manifolds and is contained in that of sG manifolds, we exhibit examples showing these inclusions to be strict and sGG manifolds to be unrelated to balanced manifolds and to those whose Frölicher spectral sequence degenerates at E_1. This new manifold class is also shown to be stable under small deformations of the complex structure and under modifications, while we notice three examples showing it not to be deformation closed. Although the Hodge decomposition need not hold on sGG manifolds, we prove the existence of a weaker substitute thereof that we call *fake Hodge-Aeppli decomposition* and that we then use to prove semi-continuity properties of the pseudo-effective and the Gauduchon cones under deformations.

1 Introduction

It has long been conjectured that the deformation limit X_0 of any holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ (where Δ is e.g. an open disc about 0 in $\mathbb{C}$) such that X_t is a *class* $\mathcal{C}$ manifold for every $t \in \Delta\setminus\{0\}$ ought to be again a *class* $\mathcal{C}$ manifold. A two-step strategy for tackling this conjecture was briefly outlined in [Pop13b]:

(1) *prove that a compact complex manifold X belongs to the class $\mathcal{C}$ iff there are "many" closed positive $(1,1)$-currents on X.*

This would be the transcendental analogue of the following well-known fact: a compact complex manifold X is Moishezon iff there are "many" divisors on X (in the sense that the algebraic dimension of X is maximal, i.e. equal to the dimension of X as a complex manifold).

The meaning of "many" in connection with closed positive (1, 1)-currents has yet to be probed, but we suspect that it will mean that the pseudo-effective cone $\mathcal{E}_X$ of X is "maximal" at least in the following sense:

$$(i)\ \mathring{\mathcal{E}}_X \neq \emptyset \quad \text{and} \quad (ii)\ \mathcal{S}\mathcal{G}_X = \mathcal{G}_X \qquad (\star)$$

where $^\circ$ stands for "interior", while $\mathcal{SG}_X$ and $\mathcal{G}_X$ are respectively the sG cone and the Gauduchon cone of X introduced in [Pop13b] (see definitions below). Property (i) uses the non-emptiness of the interior as a way of requiring $\mathcal{E}_X$ to be fairly large, while property (ii) requires $\mathcal{G}_X$ to be fairly small, hence by duality, $\mathcal{E}_X$ to be again fairly large by a different criterion.

Each of the two properties in $(\star)$ is necessary for X to be of class $\mathcal{C}$, but none of them is sufficient on its own (see section 4 for examples of manifolds not in the class $\mathcal{C}$ whose pseudo-effective cone has non-empty interior). However, together they may become sufficient, or should condition $(\star)$ turn out to be insufficient for X to be in the class $\mathcal{C}$, it will have to be reinforced.

(2) *prove that there can only be "more" closed positive* $(1,\,1)$*-currents on* X_0 *than on the generic fibre* X_t*.*

This means that the pseudo-effective cone $\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ can only increase in the limit as $t \to 0$ (i.e. it behaves upper-semicontinuously under deformations of the complex structure of X_t), while its dual, the (closure of the) Gauduchon cone $\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$, can only decrease in the limit (i.e. it behaves lower-semicontinuously).

In this paper, we begin the implementation of this strategy by studying the manifolds defined by property (ii) in $(\star)$ and by giving a complete affirmative answer to the problem raised at step (2) of this line of argument for deformations of such manifolds.

Let X be a compact complex manifold, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = n$. We set out to investigate the following class of compact complex manifolds introduced in [Pop13b] for which we now propose the following terminology.

Definition 1.1 *We say that* X *is an* **sGG manifold** *if the sG cone of* X *coincides with the Gauduchon cone of* X*, i.e.* $\mathcal{SG}_X = \mathcal{G}_X$*.*

Recall that the Gauduchon cone of X was defined in [Pop13b] as the open convex cone $\mathcal{G}_X \subset H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ consisting of Aeppli cohomology classes $[\omega^{n-1}]_A$ of $(n-1)^{st}$ powers of Gauduchon metrics ω on X, while the sG cone was defined as

$$\mathcal{SG}_X = \mathcal{G}_X \cap \ker T \subset \mathcal{G}_X \subset H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R}),$$

i.e. the intersection of the Gauduchon cone with the kernel of the following canonical linear map

$$T \,:\, H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow H_{\bar\partial}^{n,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{C}), \quad T([\Omega]_A) := [\partial\Omega]_{\bar\partial} \qquad (1)$$

for any $[\Omega]_A \in H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$. The map T, which is nothing but the extension of ∂ in cohomology, is well defined (i.e. independent of the choice of

representative of the Aeppli class $[\Omega]_A$) and shows that the sG property is actually cohomological: either all the Gauduchon metrics ω for which ω^{n-1} belongs to a given Aeppli-Gauduchon class $[\omega^{n-1}]_A \in \mathcal{G}_X$ are strongly Gauduchon (in which case we say that $[\omega^{n-1}]_A$ is an sG class), or none of them is. Moreover, since the kernel of T is a vector subspace of $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$, its intersection with the open convex Gauduchon cone leaves this latter unchanged iff $\ker T = H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$, i.e. iff T vanishes identically. We obtain equivalent descriptions of the sGG property summed up as follows (cf. [Pop13b] for $(i) - (iii)$).

Lemma 1.2 *The following statements are equivalent:*

(i) *X is an sGG manifold;*

(ii) *the map T vanishes identically:*

(iii) *the following special case of the $\partial\bar{\partial}$-lemma holds: for every d-closed $(n,\,n-1)$-form Γ on X, if Γ is ∂-exact, then Γ is also $\bar{\partial}$-exact;*

(iv) *every Gauduchon metric ω on X is strongly Gauduchon.*

We now give two more characterisations of sGG manifolds. The first one is a numerical characterisation in terms of the Bott-Chern number $h^{0,\,1}_{BC} := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^{0,\,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ and the Hodge number $h^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}} := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$.

Theorem 1.3 *On any compact complex manifold X we have $h^{0,\,1}_{BC} \leq h^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}}$. Moreover, X is an sGG manifold if and only if $h^{0,\,1}_{BC} = h^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}}$.*

An immediate consequence is the following

Corollary 1.4 *The Iwasawa manifold and all its small deformations in its Kuranishi family are sGG manifolds (but, of course, not $\partial\bar{\partial}$-manifolds).*

Our second numerical characterisation of sGG manifolds is in terms of the first Betti number $b_1 := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} H^1_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ and the Hodge number $h^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}}$.

Theorem 1.5 *On any compact complex manifold X we have $b_1 \leq 2h^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}}$. Moreover, X is an sGG manifold if and only if $b_1 = 2h^{0,\,1}_{\bar{\partial}}$.*

This makes sGG manifolds reminiscent of compact Kähler surfaces: recall that a compact complex surface is Kähler iff b_1 is even (cf. Kodaira's classification of surfaces, [Miy74] and [Siu83], or [Buc99] and [Lam99] for a direct proof). In dimension 2, the Kähler and the sGG conditions are clearly equivalent, but in dimension ≥ 3 the sGG property is tremendously weaker than the Kähler one.

We infer from Theorem 1.5 that the sGG property of compact complex manifolds is **open** under holomorphic deformations. As usual, by a holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ we mean any proper

holomorphic submersion $\pi : \mathcal{X} \to \Delta$ between complex manifolds $\mathcal{X}$ and Δ whose fibres are denoted by $X_t = \pi^{-1}(t)$, $t \in \Delta$. We denote by $h^{p,q}_{\bar\partial}(t)$, resp. $h^{p,q}_{BC}(t)$, the Hodge number, resp. Bott-Chern number, of X_t for any t.

Corollary 1.6 *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ be any holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds. Fix an arbitrary $t_0 \in \Delta$. If X_{t_0} is an sGG manifold, then:*

(i) X_t is an sGG manifold for all $t \in \Delta$ close enough to t_0;

(ii) $h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(t) = h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(t_0)$ and $h^{0,1}_{BC}(t) = h^{0,1}_{BC}(t_0)$ for all $t \in \Delta$ close enough to t_0.

Unfortunately, the sGG property is not deformation closed (cf. Proposition 7.2). However, another positive consequence of Theorem 1.5 is the invariance of the sGG property under modifications.

Corollary 1.7 *Let $\mu : \widetilde{X} \to X$ be a holomorphic bimeromorphic map between compact complex manifolds $\widetilde{X}, X$. Then the following equivalence holds:*

$$\widetilde{X} \text{ is an sGG manifold} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad X \text{ is an sGG manifold.}$$

We would like to stress that although the sGG property of compact complex manifolds is a natural reinforcement (hopefully with multiple ramifications) of the strongly Gauduchon (sG) property, different reinforcements are possible. One of them is the following.

We say that a Hermitian metric ω on a complex manifold X of dimension n is *superstrong Gauduchon*[1] *(super sG)* if $\partial\omega^{n-1}$ is $\partial\bar\partial$-exact, while X is said to be a *superstrong Gauduchon manifold (super sG manifold)* if it supports such a metric.

Any superstrong Gauduchon metric is trivially strongly Gauduchon and the two notions are equivalent if X satisfies the $\partial\bar\partial$-lemma. It is also clear that any balanced metric is superstrong Gauduchon. While the usefulness of superstrong Gauduchon metrics has yet to be probed, we sum up below the implication relations among these classes of compact complex manifolds X.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} X \text{ balanced manifold} & \Longrightarrow & X \text{ super sG manifold} & & \\ & \nearrow\!\!\!\nearrow & & & \\ & & & \searrow & (\star\star) \\ X\ \partial\bar\partial\text{-manifold} & \Longrightarrow & X \text{ sGG manifold} & \Longrightarrow & X \text{ sG manifold} \end{array}$$

It will be shown by means of examples in section 6 that both implications on the last line in diagram $(\star\star)$ are strict, while the sGG and the super sG classes are unrelated (cf. Proposition 6.4) and so are the balanced and the sGG

1. This term was coined by M. Verbitsky in a private conversation with one of the authors who was simultaneously contemplating the same notion.

classes (cf. Proposition 6.3). Thus, the class of sGG manifolds investigated in this work is new.

In connection with the second step of the strategy outlined above, recall the by now classical definition of the pseudo-effective cone of a compact complex manifold X (cf. [Dem92]):

$$\mathcal{E}_X := \{[T]_{BC} \in H^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{R}) \,/\, T \text{ is a closed positive } (1,1) - \text{current on } X\},$$

where one bears in mind that the Bott-Chern cohomology, much like all the other familiar cohomologies, can be computed using either smooth differential forms or currents. On the other hand, under the duality (see e.g. [Pop13b]):

$$H^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C}) \times H^{n-1,n-1}_{A}(X, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \quad ([\alpha]_{BC}, [\beta]_A) \mapsto \int\limits_X \alpha \wedge \beta, \qquad (2)$$

the pseudo-effective cone $\mathcal{E}_X \subset H^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{R})$ and the closure of the Gauduchon cone $\overline{\mathcal{G}_X} \subset H^{n-1,n-1}_{A}(X, \mathbb{R})$ are dual to each other thanks to Lamari's duality lemma (cf. [Lam99, Lemme 3.3]).

In section 5, we prove the following semi-continuity properties for these two cones in families of sGG manifolds.

Theorem 1.8 *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ be any holomorphic family of* **sGG** *compact complex manifolds. Then $\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ behaves lower-semicontinuously, while $\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ behaves upper-semicontinuously w.r.t. the usual topology of Δ as $t \in \Delta$ varies.*

More precise statements will be given in Theorems 5.7 and 5.9. The main tool that we introduce in §.5.1 to prove Theorem 1.8 in §.5.2 is a pair of linear maps (P, Q_ω) that we term *fake Hodge-Aeppli decomposition* of $H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R})$ when X is a compact sGG manifold of complex dimension n:

$$P \,:\, H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R}) \twoheadrightarrow H^{n-1,n-1}_{A}(X, \mathbb{R})$$

is a canonical surjection mimicking the projection onto $H^{n-1,n-1}_{A}(X, \mathbb{R})$, while with any Hermitian metric ω on X we associate a natural injection

$$Q_\omega \,:\, H^{n-1,n-1}_{A}(X, \mathbb{R}) \hookrightarrow H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R})$$

such that $P \circ Q_\omega$ is the identity map of $H^{n-1,n-1}_{A}(X, \mathbb{R})$.

Notation. On a given compact complex manifold X of dimension n, for every $p, q = 0, 1, \ldots, n$ we let $H^{p,q}_{BC}(X, C) := (\ker\partial \cap \ker\bar\partial)/\mathrm{Im}\,(\partial\bar\partial)$ and $H^{p,q}_{A}(X, C) := \ker(\partial\bar\partial)/(\mathrm{Im}\,\partial + \mathrm{Im}\,\bar\partial)$ denote the Bott-Chern, resp. Aeppli cohomology groups of bidegree (p, q), while $[\,]_{BC}, [\,]_A, [\,]_{\bar\partial}$ and $\{\,\}_{DR}$ denote Bott-Chern, Aeppli, Dolbeault and resp. De Rham cohomology classes. If a Hermitian metric ω has been fixed on X, we denote by $\Delta_A := \partial\partial^\star + \bar\partial\bar\partial^\star + (\partial\bar\partial)^\star(\partial\bar\partial) + (\partial\bar\partial)(\partial\bar\partial)^\star + (\partial\bar\partial^\star)(\partial\bar\partial^\star)^\star + (\partial\bar\partial^\star)^\star(\partial\bar\partial^\star)$ the associated Aeppli

Laplacian (which is a self-adjoint, elliptic operator of order 4) in which all the adjoints are computed w.r.t. the L^2 scalar product defined by ω on the space $C^\infty_{p,\,q}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ of $\mathbb{C}$-valued smooth $(p,\,q)$-forms on X. Thus $\Delta_A : C^\infty_{p,\,q}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \to C^\infty_{p,\,q}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ and the Hodge isomorphism $H^{p,\,q}_A(X,\,C) \simeq \ker \Delta_A$ holds, so every Aeppli cohomology class contains a unique Δ_A-harmonic representative. (See e.g. [Pop13b, §.2] for a review of these matters and further details.) On the other hand, $\Delta'' : C^\infty_{p,\,q}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \to C^\infty_{p,\,q}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ will denote the $\bar\partial$-Laplacian $\Delta'' = \bar\partial\bar\partial^\star + \bar\partial^\star\bar\partial$.

2 Bott-Chern and Hodge numbers $h^{0,\,1}_{BC},\ h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}$

In this section we prove a more precise version of Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 2.1 *Let X be any compact complex manifold, $dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = n$.*

(i) There is a well-defined canonical $\mathbb{C}$-linear map

$$S \,:\, H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow H^{n,\,n-1}_A(X,\,\mathbb{C}), \quad S([\Gamma]_{\bar\partial}) := [\Gamma]_A.$$

Moreover, the map S is **surjective**, *and we have an exact sequence*

$$H^{n-1,\,n-1}_A(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{T} H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{S} H^{n,\,n-1}_A(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow 0,$$

i.e. $Im\,T = \ker S$, where T is the map defined in (1). In particular, X is an sGG manifold if and only if S is injective (i.e. if and only if S is bijective).

(ii) There are well-defined canonical $\mathbb{C}$-linear maps and an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H^{0,\,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{S^\star} H^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{T^\star} H^{1,\,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$$

defined by $S^\star([u]_{BC}) := [u]_{\bar\partial}$ for any d-closed $(0,\,1)$-form u and $T^\star([v]_{\bar\partial}) := [\partial v]_{BC}$ for any $\bar\partial$-closed $(0,\,1)$-form v. Thus $Im\,S^\star = \ker T^\star$.

Moreover, the maps $S^\star$ and $T^\star$ are dual to S and respectively T. Thus $S^\star$ is **injective**, *hence $h^{0,\,1}_{BC} \leq h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}$.*

(iii) It follows that X is an sGG manifold if and only if $S^\star$ is surjective (i.e. if and only if $S^\star$ is bijective) if and only if $h^{0,\,1}_{BC} = h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}$.

Proof. To show that S is well defined, let Γ be any $\bar\partial$-closed $(n,\,n-1)$-form. Then $\partial\bar\partial\Gamma = 0$, hence Γ defines an Aeppli class $[\Gamma]_A$. If Γ_1, Γ_2 are $\bar\partial$-closed $(n,\,n-1)$-forms defining the same Dolbeault class (i.e. $\Gamma_1 - \Gamma_2 \in \mathrm{Im}\,\bar\partial$), then Γ_1, Γ_2 define the same Aeppli class since $\mathrm{Im}\,\bar\partial \subset \mathrm{Im}\,\partial + \mathrm{Im}\,\bar\partial$. This shows that the definition of S does not depend on the choice of representative of the class $[\Gamma]_{\bar\partial}$, so S is well defined.

It is clear that $\mathrm{Im}\,T \subset \ker S$ since $\mathrm{Im}\,\partial \subset \mathrm{Im}\,\partial + \mathrm{Im}\,\bar\partial$. To show the reverse inclusion, let $[\Gamma]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}$ such that $S([\Gamma]_{\bar\partial}) = 0$. Then there are forms Ω, Λ

of respective bidegrees $(n-1,\, n-1)$ and $(n,\, n-2)$ such that $\Gamma = \partial\Omega + \bar\partial\Lambda$, i.e. $\Gamma - \bar\partial\Lambda = \partial\Omega$. Hence $\partial\bar\partial\Omega = 0$, $[\Gamma]_{\bar\partial} = [\Gamma - \bar\partial\Lambda]_{\bar\partial}$ and $T([\Omega]_A) = [\partial\Omega]_{\bar\partial} = [\Gamma]_{\bar\partial}$. Thus $[\Gamma]_{\bar\partial} \in \operatorname{Im} T$. This proves the identity $\operatorname{Im} T = \ker S$.

The surjectivity of S will follow from the injectivity of its dual map $S^\star$ that will be proved below.

The well-definedness of $S^\star$ and $T^\star$ are proved in a similar way. The identity $\operatorname{Im} S^\star = \ker T^\star$ follows by duality from $\operatorname{Im} T = \ker S$ or directly in the following way. Let $[u]_{BC} \in H^{0,\,1}_{BC}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$, i.e. u is a d-closed $(0,\, 1)$-form. Then $\partial u = 0$ and $\bar\partial u = 0$, hence $T^\star(S^\star[u]_{BC}) = T^\star([u]_{\bar\partial}) = [\partial u]_{BC} = 0$. Thus $\operatorname{Im} S^\star \subset \ker T^\star$. To show the reverse inclusion, let $[v]_{\bar\partial} \in \ker T^\star$, i.e. v is a $\bar\partial$-closed $(0,\, 1)$-form such that $\partial v = \partial\bar\partial f$ for some function f. Then $\partial(v - \bar\partial f) = 0$, hence $d(v - \bar\partial f) = 0$ and $[v]_{\bar\partial} = [v - \bar\partial f]_{\bar\partial} = S^\star([v - \bar\partial f]_{BC})$, so $[v]_{\bar\partial} \in \operatorname{Im} S^\star$.

Let us now show that $S^\star$ is injective. Let $[u]_{BC} \in \ker S^\star$, i.e. u is a d-closed $(0,\, 1)$-form such that $u = \bar\partial f$ for some function f. Since $du = 0$, we also have $\partial u = 0$, hence $\partial\bar\partial f = 0$ on X. Because X is compact, the function f must be constant, hence $u = \bar\partial f = 0$. In particular, $[u]_{BC} = 0$.

Let us now check that the maps T and $T^\star$ are dual to each other under the duality (2) and under the Serre duality

$$H^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \times H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}, \qquad ([v]_{\bar\partial},\, [\Gamma]_{\bar\partial}) \mapsto \int\limits_X v \wedge \Gamma,$$

the latter being defined for every $\bar\partial$-closed forms v and Γ of respective bidegrees $(0,\, 1)$ and $(n,\, n-1)$. We have to check that for every $[v]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \simeq (H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}))^\star$, if we denote by

$$\sigma_v \,:\, H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

the linear map induced by $[v]_{\bar\partial}$ under duality, then the linear map

$$\tau_{\partial v} \,:\, H^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$$

induced by $T^\star([v]_{\bar\partial}) = [\partial v]_{BC} \in H^{1,\,1}_{BC}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \simeq (H^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X,\, \mathbb{C}))^\star$ under duality is $\sigma_v \circ T$. This is indeed the case since, for every $[\Omega]_A \in H^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$, we have

$$(\sigma_v \circ T)([\Omega]_A) = \sigma_v([\partial\Omega]_{\bar\partial}) = \int\limits_X v \wedge \partial\Omega = \int\limits_X \partial v \wedge \Omega = \tau_{\partial v}([\Omega]_A),$$

having used the Stokes formula $\int_X \partial(v\wedge\Omega) = 0$ and $\partial(v\wedge\Omega) = \partial v\wedge\Omega - v\wedge\partial\Omega$.

We can now check the equivalence:

$$T \text{ vanishes identically } \iff T^\star \text{ vanishes identically.}$$

Indeed, T vanishes identically if and only if for every $[\Omega]_A \in H^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$ and every $[v]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$ we have $\int_X \partial\Omega\wedge v = 0$. Since $\int_X \partial\Omega\wedge v = \int_X \Omega\wedge \partial v$ by the Stokes formula, this is equivalent to the map $\tau_{\partial v} \,:\, H^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \to \mathbb{C}$ vanishing identically, i.e. to $[\partial v]_{BC} = 0$, for every $[v]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$. Since $[\partial v]_{BC} = T^\star([v]_{\bar\partial})$, this is still equivalent to the map $T^\star$ vanishing identically.

Thus, if we put the various bits together, we get the equivalences:

$$\begin{aligned} X \text{ is an sGG manifold} &\iff \operatorname{Im} T = 0 \iff \ker S = 0 \iff S \text{ is injective} \\ &\iff \ker T^\star = H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X, \mathbb{C}) \iff \operatorname{Im} S^\star = H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X, \mathbb{C}) \\ &\iff S^\star \text{ is surjective.} \end{aligned}$$

It can be checked that the maps S and $S^\star$ are dual to each other in the same way as the duality between T and $T^\star$ has been checked. □

Proof of Corollary 1.4. Reading the dimension tables for the Hodge and Bott-Chern numbers given in [Nak75, p.96] and resp. [Ang11, Theorem 5.1], we gather that

$$h^{0,1}_{BC} = h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial} = 2$$

for the Iwasawa manifold and all its small deformations. Thus, the conclusion follows from Theorem 1.3. □

3 Betti and Hodge numbers b_1, $h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}$

In this section we prove a more precise version of Theorem 1.5 from which the latter follows as a corollary. For any form α, we denote by $\alpha^{p,q}$ its component of bidegree (p, q).

Theorem 3.1 *Let X be any compact complex manifold, $dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = n$.*

(i) There is a well-defined canonical $\mathbb{C}$-linear map

$$\begin{aligned} F : H^1_{DR}(X, \mathbb{C}) &\longrightarrow H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \overline{H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X, \mathbb{C})}, \\ F(\{\alpha\}_{DR}) &:= ([\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial}, \overline{[\overline{\alpha^{1,0}}]_{\bar\partial}}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the map F is **injective**. *Consequently, the following inequality holds on any compact complex manifold:*

$$b_1 \leq 2h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}.$$

(ii) There is a well-defined canonical $\mathbb{C}$-linear map:

$$\begin{aligned} F^\star : H^{n,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \overline{H^{n,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X, \mathbb{C})} &\longrightarrow H^{2n-1}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{C}), \\ F^\star([\beta]_{\bar\partial}, \overline{[\gamma]_{\bar\partial}}) &:= \{\beta + \bar\gamma\}_{DR}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the map $F^\star$ is dual to the map F. Hence $F^\star$ is **surjective**.

(iii) The following equivalence holds:

$$X \text{ is an sGG manifold} \iff F^\star \text{ is injective.}$$

Proof. (i) For any 1-form α, the condition $d\alpha = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\bar\partial\alpha^{0,1} = 0, \quad \partial\alpha^{1,0} = 0 \ (\Leftrightarrow \bar\partial\overline{\alpha^{1,0}} = 0), \quad \partial\alpha^{0,1} + \bar\partial\alpha^{1,0} = 0.$$

Thus, if $d\alpha = 0$, $\alpha^{0,1}$ and $\overline{\alpha^{1,0}}$ define Dolbeault cohomology classes of type (0, 1). To show that the map F is independent of the choice of representative in a given De Rham class $\{\alpha\}_{DR}$, let α be any d-exact 1-form on X. Then, there exists a function f on X such that $\alpha = df = \partial f + \bar\partial f$. Hence $\alpha^{0,1} = \bar\partial f$ and $\overline{\alpha^{1,0}} = \bar\partial\bar f$, so $[\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial} = [\overline{\alpha^{1,0}}]_{\bar\partial} = 0$. This proves the well-definedness of the map F.

To prove that F is injective, let α be a d-closed 1-form such that $F(\{\alpha\}_{DR}) = 0$, i.e. $\alpha^{0,1} = \bar\partial f$ and $\overline{\alpha^{1,0}} = \bar\partial g$ (i.e. $\alpha^{1,0} = \partial\bar g$) for some functions f, g on X. Then

$$0 = \partial\alpha^{0,1} + \bar\partial\alpha^{1,0} = \partial\bar\partial(f - \bar g) \quad \text{on } X,$$

where the first identity follows from $\partial\alpha^{0,1} + \bar\partial\alpha^{1,0}$ being the component of bidegree (1, 1) of $d\alpha = 0$. Since X is compact, $f - \bar g$ must be constant on X, hence $\partial\bar g = \partial f$, so we get

$$\alpha = \alpha^{1,0} + \alpha^{0,1} = \partial f + \bar\partial f = df.$$

Thus $\{\alpha\}_{DR} = 0$. Consequently, F is injective.

(ii) For any $\bar\partial$-closed $(n,\, n-1)$-forms β, γ, we have $\partial\beta = \partial\gamma = 0$ for bidegree reasons, hence $d\beta = d\gamma = 0$, so $\beta + \bar\gamma$ is d-closed and therefore it defines a De Rham class. To show that $F^\star$ is independent of the choice of representatives of the classes $[\beta]_{\bar\partial}, [\gamma]_{\bar\partial}$, suppose that $\beta = \bar\partial u$ and $\gamma = \bar\partial v$ for some $(n,\, n-2)$-forms u, v. Since $\partial u = \partial v = 0$ for bidegree reasons, we see that $\beta = du$ and $\gamma = dv$, hence $\beta + \bar\gamma = d(u + \bar v)$, so $\{\beta + \bar\gamma\}_{DR} = 0$. We conclude that $F^\star$ is well defined.

We now prove that the maps F and $F^\star$ are dual to each other. Under the Serre duality $H^{n,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \simeq (H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}))^\star$, every pair $([\beta]_{\bar\partial},\, \overline{[\gamma]_{\bar\partial}}) \in H^{n,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \oplus \overline{H^{n,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C})}$ can be identified with the pair $(u,\, \bar v)$ in which $u, v \,:\, H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \to \mathbb{C}$ are the $\mathbb{C}$-linear maps acting as

$$u([\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial}) = \int\limits_X \beta \wedge \alpha^{0,1} \quad \text{and} \quad v([\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial}) = \int\limits_X \gamma \wedge \alpha^{0,1}$$

for every class $[\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$ and $\bar v \,:\, \overline{H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C})} \to \mathbb{C}$ is the $\mathbb{C}$-linear map defined by $\bar v(\overline{[\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial}}) := \overline{v([\alpha^{0,1}]_{\bar\partial})}$. Proving the duality between F and $F^\star$ amounts to proving that

$$\sigma_{\beta+\bar\gamma} = (u + \bar v) \circ F \tag{3}$$

for any $[\beta]_{\bar\partial}, [\gamma]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{n,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\, \mathbb{C})$, where $\sigma_{\beta+\bar\gamma} \,:\, H^1_{DR}(X,\, \mathbb{C}) \to \mathbb{C}$ is the $\mathbb{C}$-linear map representing the De Rham class

$$F^\star([\beta]_{\bar\partial},\, \overline{[\gamma]_{\bar\partial}}) = \{\beta+\bar\gamma\}_{DR} \in H^{2n-1}_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{C}) \simeq (H^1_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{C}))^\star$$

under Poincaré duality. By definition, this means that for every $\{\alpha\}_{DR} \in H^1_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ we have

$$\sigma_{\beta+\bar\gamma}(\{\alpha\}_{DR}) = \int\limits_X (\beta+\bar\gamma)\wedge\alpha = \int\limits_X \beta\wedge\alpha^{0,\,1} + \int\limits_X \bar\gamma\wedge\alpha^{1,\,0} = \Big((u+\bar v)\circ F\Big)(\{\alpha\}_{DR}).$$

This proves (3). We conclude that F and $F^\star$ are dual to each other.

(iii) Let us first prove the implication " $\Longrightarrow$ ". Suppose that X is an sGG manifold. Let $[\beta]_{\bar\partial}, [\gamma]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ such that $\beta+\bar\gamma = d(\Omega^{n,\,n-2}+\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}+\Omega^{n-2,\,n})$ for some forms $\Omega^{p,\,q}$ of the specified bidegrees. This amounts to having

$$\beta = \bar\partial\Omega^{n,\,n-2} + \partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar\gamma = \bar\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} + \partial\Omega^{n-2,\,n},$$

therefore to having

$$\beta - \bar\partial\Omega^{n,\,n-2} = \partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma - \bar\partial\overline{\Omega^{n-2,\,n}} = \partial\overline{\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}}.$$

Now, $\beta-\bar\partial\Omega^{n,\,n-2} \in [\beta]_{\bar\partial}$ and $\gamma-\bar\partial\overline{\Omega^{n-2,\,n}} \in [\gamma]_{\bar\partial}$. On the other hand, $\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ and $\partial\overline{\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}}$ are d-closed and ∂-exact $(n,\,n-1)$-forms on X, so the sGG assumption on X implies (thanks to (iii) of Lemma 1.2) that they are both $\bar\partial$-exact, i.e. $[\beta]_{\bar\partial} = [\gamma]_{\bar\partial} = 0$ in $H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$. We conclude that $F^\star$ is injective if X is sGG.

We now prove the reverse implication "$\Longleftarrow$". Suppose that $F^\star$ is injective. We will show that every Gauduchon metric on X is actually strongly Gauduchon. This will imply that X is an sGG manifold thanks to (iv) of Lemma 1.2.

Let ω be any Gauduchon metric on X. Then $\partial\omega^{n-1} \in \ker\bar\partial$, so we have a Dolbeault class $[\partial\omega^{n-1}]_{\bar\partial} \in H^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$. Now, $\partial\omega^{n-1} + \overline{\partial\omega^{n-1}} = d\omega^{n-1}$ and, moreover,

$$F^\star([\partial\omega^{n-1}]_{\bar\partial},\, \overline{[\partial\omega^{n-1}]_{\bar\partial}}) = \{\partial\omega^{n-1} + \overline{\partial\omega^{n-1}}\}_{DR} = \{d\omega^{n-1}\}_{DR} = 0.$$

Since $F^\star$ is supposed injective, we infer that $[\partial\omega^{n-1}]_{\bar\partial} = 0$, i.e. ω is strongly Gauduchon. □

Proof of Corollary 1.6. This is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.5 if we use the (local) invariance of the Betti numbers of the fibres in a C^∞ family of compact complex manifolds and the upper-semicontinuity of the

Hodge numbers $h^{p,\,q}(t)$ as t varies in Δ (cf. [KS60, Theorem 4]). Indeed, if X_{t_0} is an sGG manifold, we have:

$$b_1 = 2h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(t_0) \geq 2h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(t) \geq b_1 \quad \text{for all } t \text{ sufficiently close to } t_0.$$

Thus, we must have equalities $b_1 = 2h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(t_0) = 2h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}(t)$ for all t close to t_0. In particular, by Theorem 1.5, X_t must be an sGG manifold for all t close to t_0. Then Theorem 1.3 implies $h^{0,\,1}_{BC}(t_0) = h^{0,\,1}_{BC}(t)$ for t close to t_0. □

Proof of Corollary 1.7. Thanks to the characterisation of sGG manifolds given in Theorem 1.5, it suffices to ensure the invariance of b_1 and of $h^{0,\,1}_{\bar\partial}$ under modifications, both of which are standard. Indeed, the fundamental group is known to be a bimeromorphic invariant of complex manifolds, hence so is its abelianisation H_1, so also b_1.

We recall for the reader's convenience the well-known argument showing the modification invariance of every $h^{0,\,k}_{\bar\partial}$ for any compact complex manifold (not necessarily satisfying the Hodge symmetry)[2]. This invariance follows from the combination of two things. The first thing is the following standard fact giving the vanishing of the higher direct image sheaves of the structural sheaf under modifications:

Let $f : X \to Y$ be a **bimeromorphic** *morphism between (smooth) compact complex manifolds. Then:*

(i) $f_\star\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y$*;*

(ii) $R^i f_\star\mathcal{O}_X = 0$ *for all* $i > 0$*.*

The second thing is the Leray spectral sequence associated with f and $\mathcal{O}_X$. Recall that this is the spectral sequence starting at $E_2^{p,\,q} := H^p(Y,\, R^q f_\star\mathcal{O}_X)$ and converging to $H^{p+q}(X,\, \mathcal{O}_X)$. The shape of the direct image sheaves of $\mathcal{O}_X$ under f implies at once that

$$E_2^{p,\,0} = H^p(Y,\, \mathcal{O}_Y) \simeq H^{0,\,p}(Y,\, \mathbb{C}) \quad \text{and} \quad E_2^{p,\,q} = 0,\ q \geq 1.$$

It follows that the Leray spectral sequence degenerates at E_2 and we have:

$$H^k(X,\, \mathcal{O}_X) \simeq \bigoplus_{p+q=k} E_2^{p,\,q} = E_2^{k,\,0} \simeq H^{0,\,k}(Y,\, \mathbb{C}) \quad \text{for all } k. \qquad \square$$

4 The interior of the pseudo-effective cone

Starting from a handful of trivial observations, we exhibit in this section a few examples of compact complex manifolds which are not in the class $\mathcal{C}$ but whose pseudo-effective cone has non-empty interior.

2. One of the authors is very grateful to Professors A. Fujiki and F. Campana for pointing out to him this simple argument.

Proposition 4.1 *(I) Let X be a compact complex* **surface**. *Then:*

(i) there exists a non-zero d-closed $(1,1)$*-current* $T \geq 0$ *on* X*;*

(ii) $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C}) \geq 1$*;*

(iii) if $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C}) = 1$*, then* $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_X \neq \emptyset$.

(II) Let X be a compact complex manifold of any dimension.

(i) If $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C}) = 1$ *and if there exists a non-zero d-closed* $(1,1)$*-current* $T \geq 0$ *on* X*, then* $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_X \neq \emptyset$.

(ii) If $b_2(X) = 0$*, then X is not in the class* $\mathcal{C}$.

Proof. $(I)(i)$ Suppose that such a current does not exist. Then by [Pop13b, Proposition 5.4], there exists a smooth $(1,1)$-form $\omega > 0$ such that ω is d-exact (i.e. there exists a degenerate balanced structure ω on X – on any surface $n - 1 = 1$). This is impossible since no Kähler metric can be d-exact on a *compact* complex manifold.

(ii) Let $T \geq 0$ be a non-zero d-closed $(1,1)$-current on X (which exists by (i)). Then $[T]_{BC} \in H^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C})$ cannot be the zero Bott-Chern class. Indeed, suppose that $[T]_{BC} = 0$. Then $T = i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi \geq 0$ on X for some L^1_{loc} function φ, hence φ must be a global psh function on the compact manifold X, so φ must be constant and $T = i\partial\bar{\partial}\varphi = 0$. This contradicts the assumption $T \neq 0$. Hence $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C}) \geq 1$.

(iii) For any non-zero d-closed $(1,1)$-current $T \geq 0$ on X, we have: $0 \neq [T]_{BC} \in \mathcal{E}_X \subset H^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{R})$. Since $\mathcal{E}_X$ is a convex cone, it must contain the whole ray $\mathbb{R}^+ \cdot [T]_{BC}$, so it has non-empty interior in the ambient 1-dimensional real vector space.

$(II)(i)$ The proof of this statement is identical to that of $(I)(iii)$. It has been necessary to suppose the existence of a non-zero d-closed positive $(1,1)$-current since, unlike compact complex surfaces, arbitrary compact complex manifolds of dimension ≥ 3 need not possess such a current (see e.g. [Pop13b]).

$(II)(ii)$ Suppose that X is in the class $\mathcal{C}$. Then, on the one hand, X is an sG manifold, while on the other hand, by [DP04], there exists a Kähler current T on X. In particular, it defines a De Rham class $\{T\}_{DR} \in H^2_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R}) = 0$, hence T is a d-exact (non-zero positive $(1,1)$-current). The existence of a such a current is equivalent, thanks to [Pop13a, Proposition 4.3], to the manifold X not being an sG manifold. This is a contradiction. □

We now notice a few examples showing that the property $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_X \neq \emptyset$ does not imply that X is a class $\mathcal{C}$ manifold.

Proposition 4.2 *Let X be either a* **Hopf surface**, *or an* **Inoue** S_M **surface**, *or* **an Inoue** $S_\pm$ **surface**, *or a* **secondary Kodaira surface**.

Then X is not in the class $\mathcal{C}$ *but* $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_X \neq \emptyset$.

Proof. All the surfaces of the above types are non-Kähler, hence not in the class $\mathcal{C}$ (since the Kähler class coincides with the class $\mathcal{C}$ in the case of surfaces). Now, thanks to [ADT14, Theorem 2.2, Tables 1 and 2, p.8-9] [3], $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X, \mathbb{C}) = 1$ for each of these surfaces. We get $\mathring{\mathcal{E}}_X \neq \emptyset$ from part $(I)(iii)$ of our Proposition 4.1. □

5 The cones $\mathcal{G}_X$ and $\mathcal{E}_X$ under deformations

Throughout this section, as in the rest of the paper, for any differential form Ω of any degree k and for any (p, q) such that $p + q = k$, we denote by $\Omega^{p,q}$ the component of Ω of bidegree (p, q). Thus $\Omega = \sum_{p+q=k} \Omega^{p,q}$.

It will be seen in §.5.2 that the discussion of the variation of the cones $\mathcal{G}_X$ and $\mathcal{E}_X$ under deformations of the complex structure of a compact sGG manifold X would be greatly simplified if the Bott-Chern number $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X)$ were locally deformation constant. Unfortunately, this is not the case as Proposition 7.1 will show, rendering indispensable the introduction of some technical aspects in §.5.2.

5.1 Fake Hodge-Aeppli decomposition of $H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R})$

If our n-dimensional compact complex manifold X were supposed to be a $\partial\bar{\partial}$-manifold, there would exist a canonical isomorphism $H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{C}) \simeq H^{n,n-2}_A(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H^{n-1,n-1}_A(X, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H^{n-2,n}_A(X, \mathbb{C})$ (cf. [Pop13b] where this splitting was called a Hodge-Aeppli decomposition), hence in particular a canonical surjection $H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{C}) \twoheadrightarrow H^{n-1,n-1}_A(X, \mathbb{C})$ and a canonical injection $H^{n-1,n-1}_A(X, \mathbb{C}) \hookrightarrow H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{C})$ which is a section of the surjection. However, under the weaker sGG assumption on X, a complete Hodge-Aeppli decomposition in degree $2n-2$ need not exist, but we will show that a weaker substitute thereof (that will prove sufficient for our purposes later on) exists : a canonical surjection and a non-canonical but naturally-associated-with-any-given-metric injection as above exist if we restrict attention to the real cohomologies.

We start by noticing the existence of the canonical surjection.

Proposition 5.1 *Let X be an arbitrary compact complex manifold, $dim_{\mathbb{C}} X = n$. The following canonical linear map*

$$P : H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R}) \to H^{n-1,n-1}_A(X, \mathbb{R}), \quad \{\Omega\}_{DR} \mapsto [\Omega^{n-1,n-1}]_A, \qquad (4)$$

is well defined. Furthermore, if X is an sGG manifold, P is surjective.

3. We are very grateful to F. Campana for pointing out this reference to us.

Proof. Let $\Omega = \Omega^{n,\,n-2} + \Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} + \Omega^{n-2,\,n}$ be any d-closed (not necessarily real) C^∞ form of degree $2n-2$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} d\Omega = 0 \quad &\Longleftrightarrow \quad \partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} + \bar\partial\Omega^{n,\,n-2} = 0 \text{ and } \partial\Omega^{n-2,\,n} + \bar\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = 0 \\ &\Longrightarrow \quad \partial\bar\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The last identity shows that $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ defines indeed an Aeppli cohomology class of bidegree $(n-1,\,n-1)$. To show well-definedness for P, we still have to show that the definition is independent of the choice of representative of the De Rham class $\{\Omega\}_{DR}$. Let Ω_1, Ω_2 represent the same De Rham class, i.e. $\Omega := \Omega_1 - \Omega_2$ is d-exact. Then there exists a $(2n-3)$-form Γ such that $\Omega = d(\Gamma^{n,\,n-3} + \Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2} + \Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1} + \Gamma^{n-3,\,n})$. Thus, the d-exactness of a $(2n-2)$-form Ω is equivalent to the existence of $\Gamma \in C^\infty_{2n-3}(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{n,\,n-2} &\overset{(i)}{=} \partial\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2} + \bar\partial\Gamma^{n,\,n-3} \\ \Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} &\overset{(ii)}{=} \partial\Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1} + \bar\partial\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2} \\ \Omega^{n-2,\,n} &\overset{(iii)}{=} \partial\Gamma^{n-3,\,n} + \bar\partial\Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Identity (ii) above means that $[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A = 0$, i.e. $[\Omega_1^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A = [\Omega_2^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A$.

Let us now suppose that X is an sGG manifold. Pick any class $[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A \in H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ with $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ *real*. Then $\partial\bar\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = 0$, hence $d(\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}) = 0$. Since $\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is a ∂-exact d-closed $(n,\,n-1)$-form, the sGG assumption on X implies that $\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is $\bar\partial$-exact (see Lemma 1.2). Thus, there exists an $(n,\,n-2)$-form $\Omega^{n,\,n-2}$ such that

$\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = -\bar\partial\Omega^{n,\,n-2}$ hence, since $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is real, $\bar\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = -\partial\overline{\Omega^{n,\,n-2}}$.

Then the $(2n-2)$-form $\Omega := \Omega^{n,\,n-2} + \Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} + \overline{\Omega^{n,\,n-2}}$ is real and $d\Omega = 0$ (cf. (5)). It is clear that $P(\{\Omega\}_{DR}) = [\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A$. This proves that P is surjective. □

Corollary 5.2 *If X is an sGG compact complex manifold with $dim_{\mathbb{C}}X = n$, the dual map of P:*

$$P^\star \,:\, H^{1,\,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) \to H^2_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{R}), \quad [\alpha]_{BC} \mapsto \{\alpha\}_{DR}, \tag{7}$$

is injective. (Of course, $P^\star$ is canonically well defined for any X but it need not be injective if X is not sGG.)

That $P^\star$ is indeed the dual map of P follows immediately from the identity $\int_X \alpha\wedge\Omega = \int_X \alpha\wedge\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ which holds for bidegree reasons for any class $[\alpha]_{BC} \in H^{1,\,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{R}))$ and any class $\{\Omega\}_{DR} \in H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$.

No canonical right inverse of P need exist when X is only an sGG manifold, but for any given Hermitian metric on X we will now construct a right inverse of P depending on the chosen metric.

Definition 5.3 *Let X be an sGG compact complex manifold with $dim_{\mathbb{C}}X = n$ and let ω be an arbitrary Hermitian metric on X. With ω we associate the following injective linear map*

$$Q_\omega \,:\, H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) \to H_{DR}^{2n-2}(X,\,\mathbb{R}), \quad [\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A \mapsto \{\Omega\}_{DR}, \qquad (8)$$

where the real d-closed $(2n-2)$-form Ω on X is determined by a given real $\partial\bar\partial$-closed $(n-1,\,n-1)$-form $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ and by the metric ω in the following way.

(i) If Δ_A denotes the Aeppli Laplacian associated with ω, we have an orthogonal (w.r.t. the L^2 inner product defined by ω) splitting

$$\ker(\partial\bar\partial) = \ker\Delta_A \oplus (Im\,\partial + Im\,\bar\partial) \qquad \textit{(see e.g. [Pop13, §.2])},$$

which induces a splitting of $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} \in \ker(\partial\bar\partial)$ as

$$\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = \Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1} + \partial\Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1} + \bar\partial\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2}, \qquad (9)$$

where $\Delta_A\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1} = 0$. The forms $\Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1}$, $\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2}$ are of the shown bidegrees and are not uniquely determined, but we will see that the definition of Q_ω does not depend on their choices. (Since $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is real, we can always choose $\Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1} = \overline{\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2}}$.)

(ii) Since $\bar\partial(\partial\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1}) = 0$, we also have $d(\partial\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1}) = 0$. Thus the sGG assumption on X and Lemma 1.2 ensure that $\partial\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is $\bar\partial$-exact, i.e. there exists a smooth $(n,\,n-2)$-form $\Omega_A^{n,\,n-2}$ such that

$$\partial\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1} = \bar\partial(-\Omega_A^{n,\,n-2}). \qquad (10)$$

We choose $\Omega_A^{n,\,n-2}$ to be the solution of equation (10) of minimal L^2-norm (defined by ω). Thus $\Omega_A^{n,\,n-2}$ is uniquely determined by the formula

$$\Omega_A^{n,\,n-2} = -\bar\partial^\star\Delta''^{-1}(\partial\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1}). \qquad (11)$$

(iii) Taking ∂ in (9) and using (10), we get:

$$\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = \partial\Omega_A^{n-1,\,n-1} + \partial\bar\partial\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2} = \bar\partial(-\Omega_A^{n,\,n-2} - \partial\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2}).$$

We set $\Omega^{n,\,n-2} := \Omega_A^{n,\,n-2} + \partial\Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2}$. Thus we get:

$$\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = \bar\partial(-\Omega^{n,\,n-2}), \quad \textit{hende also} \quad \bar\partial\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} = \partial(-\overline{\Omega^{n,\,n-2}}), \qquad (12)$$

where the latter identity follows from the former by taking conjugates and using the fact that $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is real.

(iv) We set $\Omega := \Omega^{n,\,n-2} + \Omega^{n-1,\,n-1} + \overline{\Omega^{n,\,n-2}}$. It is clear that Ω is a real $(2n-2)$-form on X and $d\Omega = 0$ (compare (12) with (5)).

We now make the trivial observation that Definition 5.3 is correct.

Lemma 5.4 *The map Q_ω is well defined and injective. Moreover, the composed linear map $P \circ Q_\omega : H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) \to H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ is the identity map of $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ (so Q_ω is a section of P).*

Proof. For well-definedness, we need to show that $Q_\omega([\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A)$ does not depend either on the choice of representative of the Aeppli class $[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A$ or on the choice of the forms $\Gamma^{n-2,\,n-1}, \Gamma^{n-1,\,n-2}$ in (9). Let us consider two *real* representatives of a same *real* Aeppli class:

$$[\Omega_1^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A = [\Omega_2^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A.$$

Let $\Omega_j = \Omega_j^{n,\,n-2} + \Omega_j^{n-1,\,n-1} + \overline{\Omega_j^{n,\,n-2}}$ $(j = 1, 2)$ be the real d-closed $(2n-2)$-forms on X determined by $\Omega_j^{n-1,\,n-1}$ and ω as described in Definition 5.3.

Since the Δ_A-harmonic representative of a given Aeppli class is unique, we infer that $\Omega_{1,\,A}^{n-1,\,n-1} = \Omega_{2,\,A}^{n-1,\,n-1}$ (i.e. $\Omega_1^{n-1,\,n-1}$ and $\Omega_2^{n-1,\,n-1}$ have the same Δ_A-harmonic projection). This implies that $\Omega_{1,\,A}^{n,\,n-2} = \Omega_{2,\,A}^{n,\,n-2}$ since the solution of minimal L^2-norm of a $\bar\partial$-equation (equation (10) here) is unique. This further implies that

$$\Omega_1^{n,\,n-2} - \Omega_2^{n,\,n-2} = \partial(\Gamma_1^{n-1,\,n-2} - \Gamma_2^{n-1,\,n-2}). \tag{13}$$

On the other hand, (9) spells

$$\Omega_j^{n-1,\,n-1} = \Omega_{j,\,A}^{n-1,\,n-1} + \partial\Gamma_j^{n-2,\,n-1} + \bar\partial\Gamma_j^{n-1,\,n-2}, \qquad j = 1, 2,$$

which gives, since $\Omega_{1,\,A}^{n-1,\,n-1} = \Omega_{2,\,A}^{n-1,\,n-1}$, the identity

$$\Omega_1^{n-1,\,n-1} - \Omega_2^{n-1,\,n-1} = \partial(\Gamma_1^{n-2,\,n-1} - \Gamma_2^{n-2,\,n-1}) + \bar\partial(\Gamma_1^{n-1,\,n-2} - \Gamma_2^{n-1,\,n-2}). \tag{14}$$

We see that (13) and (14) amount to the d-exactness condition (6) for the real $(2n-2)$-form $\Omega := \Omega_1 - \Omega_2$ (where we choose $\Gamma^{n,\,n-3} = 0$ and $\Gamma^{n-3,\,n} = 0$). Thus $\Omega_1 - \Omega_2$ is d-exact, i.e. $\{\Omega_1\}_{DR} = \{\Omega_2\}_{DR}$, so $Q_\omega([\Omega_1^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A) = Q_\omega([\Omega_2^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A)$.

To show that Q_ω is injective, let $Q_\omega([\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A) = 0$, i.e. $\{\Omega\}_{DR} = 0$. This means that Ω is d-exact, which in turn means that the identities (6) hold. It is clear that (ii) of (6) expresses the fact that $[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A = 0$.

The fact that $P \circ Q_\omega([\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A) = [\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A$ for any class $[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A \in H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ follows immediately from the definitions of P and Q_ω: the original $(n-1,\,n-1)$-form $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ is indeed the $(n-1,\,n-1)$-component of the $(2n-2)$-form constructed from $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ in Definition 5.3. □

Putting these pieces of information together, we immediately get the

Corollary 5.5 *Let X be an sGG compact complex manifold, $dim_{\mathbb{C}}X = n$.*
(i) For any Hermitian metric ω on X, the dual map of Q_ω:

$$Q_\omega^\star \,:\, H^2_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) \to H^{1,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) \tag{15}$$

is surjective. Moreover, the composed linear map $Q_\omega^\star \circ P^\star \,:\, H^{1,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) \to H^{1,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ is the identity map of $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$.
(ii) The dual map $Q_\omega^\star$ is explicitly defined by the identity

$$\int\limits_X Q_\omega^\star(\{\alpha\}_{DR}) \wedge [\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A = \int\limits_X \{\alpha\}_{DR} \wedge Q_\omega([\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A) \tag{16}$$

for any classes $\{\alpha\}_{DR} \in H^2_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ and $[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A \in H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$.

(The meaning of cohomology classes in (16) is that the integrals do not depend on the choice of representatives in those classes.)

We can well call the pair of maps $(P,\,Q_\omega)$ a *fake Hodge-Aeppli decomposition* of $H^{2n-2}_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$ and the dual pair of maps $(P^\star,\,Q_\omega^\star)$ the *dual fake Hodge-Bott-Chern decomposition* of $H^2_{DR}(X,\,\mathbb{R})$.

5.2 Deformation semicontinuity of $\mathcal{G}_X$ and $\mathcal{E}_X$

We now use the fake Hodge decomposition of the previous subsection to study the variations of the Gauduchon cone $\mathcal{G}_X$ and of the pseudo-effective cone $\mathcal{E}_X$ under small deformations of the sGG complex structure of X.

Let $\pi \,:\, \mathcal{X} \to \Delta$ be a holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ is an open disc about the origin. The fibres $X_t := \pi^{-1}(t) \subset \mathcal{X}$ $(t \in \Delta)$ are thus compact complex manifolds of equal dimension n and the family is C^∞ locally trivial, hence the De Rham cohomology groups of the fibres can be identified with a fixed space $H^k(X,\,\mathbb{C})$ for every $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 2n$. As the complex structure of X_t varies with $t \in \Delta$, the Bott-Chern, Dolbeault and Aeppli cohomologies of the fibres depend on t.

Suppose moreover that X_0 is an sGG manifold. Then X_t is an sGG manifold for all $t \in \Delta$ sufficiently close to 0 by our Corollary 1.6. After shrinking Δ about 0, we can assume that X_t is an sGG manifold for all $t \in \Delta$. We fix any C^∞ family $(\omega_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ of Hermitian metrics on the respective fibres $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$. Let $t_0 \in \Delta$ be an arbitrary point (e.g. we take $t_0 = 0$).

(I) Variation of the Gauduchon cone

The *fake Hodge-Aeppli decomposition* constructed in the previous subsection on each fibre X_t gives us maps as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\,\mathbb{R}) & \overset{Q_{\omega_0}}{\hookrightarrow} & H_{DR}^{2n-2}(X,\,\mathbb{R}) & \overset{P_t}{\twoheadrightarrow} & H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t,\,\mathbb{R}), \quad t\in\Delta. \\ \bigcup & & & & \bigcup \\ \mathcal{G}_{X_0} & & & & \mathcal{G}_{X_t} \end{array}$$

Thus the image of the Gauduchon cone $\mathcal{G}_{X_0}$ of X_0 via the composed map $P_t\circ Q_{\omega_0}\,:\,H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\,\mathbb{R})\to H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t,\,\mathbb{R})$ can be compared to $\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ as subsets of $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t,\,\mathbb{R})$. Note that $P_0\circ Q_{\omega_0}=\mathrm{Id}_{H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\,\mathbb{R})}$ and it follows from [KS60, Theorem 5] that the surjections $(P_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ vary in a C^∞ way with t (hence the maps $P_t\circ Q_{\omega_0}$ are isomorphisms) if the dimension of $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t,\,\mathbb{R})$ $(=h_{BC}^{1,\,1}(t)$ by duality) is independent of t. However, if $h_{BC}^{1,\,1}(0)>h_{BC}^{1,\,1}(t)$ for $t\neq 0$ close to 0, the Gauduchon cone $\mathcal{G}_{X_0}$ of X_0 has more dimensions than its counterparts $\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ on the nearby fibres, but the projections P_t for $t\neq 0$ "cut out" the extra dimensions in $(P_t\circ Q_{\omega_0})(\mathcal{G}_{X_0})$. It seems sensible to introduce the following definition.

Definition 5.6 *If $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ is a holomorphic family of* **sGG** *compact complex n-dimensional manifolds, the* **limit as $t\to t_0$ of the Gauduchon cones** $\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ *of the fibres X_t for $t\neq t_0$ is defined as the following subset of $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{R})$:*

$$\lim_{t\to t_0}\mathcal{G}_{X_t}:=\left\{[\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A\in H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{R})\,/\,(P_t\circ Q_{\omega_{t_0}})([\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A)\in\mathcal{G}_{X_t}\ \ \forall t\sim t_0\right\},$$

where "$\forall t\sim t_0$" means "for all t sufficiently close to t_0".

Note that $\lim\limits_{t\to t_0}\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ depends on the metric ω_{t_0} (since $Q_{\omega_{t_0}}$ depends thereon) but does not depend on the way in which ω_{t_0} has been extended in a C^∞ fashion to metrics ω_t on the nearby fibres (since the maps P_t are canonical).

We can now prove that the Gauduchon cone $\mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ of the sGG fibre X_t behaves lower-semicontinuously w.r.t. $t\in\Delta$ in the usual topology of Δ much as it did in the special case of families of $\partial\bar\partial$-manifolds treated in [Pop13b].

Theorem 5.7 *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ be any holomorphic family of* **sGG** *compact complex manifolds endowed with any C^∞ family $(\omega_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ of Hermitian metrics.*

Then, for all $t_0\in\Delta$, the following inclusion holds:

$$\mathcal{G}_{X_{t_0}}\subset\lim_{t\to t_0}\mathcal{G}_{X_t}.$$

Proof. We may assume that $t_0=0$. Denote by n the complex dimension of the fibres and let $[\gamma_0^{n-1}]_A\in\mathcal{G}_{X_0}$ for some Gauduchon metric $\gamma_0>0$ on X_0. Let Ω be the C^∞ real d-closed $(2n-2)$-form determined by γ_0^{n-1} and by the Hermitian metric ω_0 as in Definition 5.3. For every $t\in\Delta$, the splitting of Ω into pure-type forms reads:

$$\Omega = \Omega_t^{n,\,n-2} + \Omega_t^{n-1,\,n-1} + \Omega_t^{n-2,\,n}, \quad t \in \Delta,$$

where $\Omega_0^{n-1,\,n-1} = \gamma_0^{n-1}$. Then $(P_t \circ Q_{\omega_0})([\gamma_0^{n-1}]_A) = P_t(\{\Omega\}_{DR}) = [\Omega_t^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A \in H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t, \mathbb{R})$ for all $t \in \Delta$. Since $\Omega_0^{n-1,\,n-1} > 0$ and the $\Omega_t^{n-1,\,n-1}$ vary in a C^∞ way with $t \in \Delta$ (as components of the fixed form Ω), we get

$$\Omega_t^{n-1,\,n-1} > 0 \quad \text{for all } t \text{ sufficiently close to } 0,$$

hence there exists a unique Gauduchon metric γ_t on X_t such that $\gamma_t^{n-1} = \Omega_t^{n-1,\,n-1}$, so $[\Omega_t^{n-1,\,n-1}]_A \in \mathcal{G}_{X_t}$ for all t close to 0. Thus $[\gamma_0^{n-1}]_A \in \lim\limits_{t \to t_0} \mathcal{G}_{X_t}$.

□

(II) Dual situation : variation of the pseudo-effective cone

The dual of the *fake Hodge-Aeppli decomposition* constructed in the previous subsection on each fibre X_t gives us maps as follows:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{R}) & \overset{P_0^\star}{\hookrightarrow} & H^2_{DR}(X, \mathbb{R}) & \overset{Q^\star_{\omega_t}}{\twoheadrightarrow} & H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t, \mathbb{R}), \quad t \in \Delta. \\ \bigcup & & & & \bigcup \\ \mathcal{E}_{X_0} & & & & \mathcal{E}_{X_t} \end{array}$$

Clearly, $Q^\star_{\omega_0} \circ P_0^\star = \mathrm{Id}_{H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{R})}$ and it follows from [KS60, Theorem 5] that the surjections $(Q^\star_{\omega_t})_{t \in \Delta}$ vary in a C^∞ way with t (hence the maps $Q^\star_{\omega_t} \circ P_0^\star$ are isomorphisms) if the dimension of $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t, \mathbb{R})$ $(= h^{1,1}_{BC}(t))$ is independent of t. However, if $h^{1,1}_{BC}(0) > h^{1,1}_{BC}(t)$ for $t \neq 0$ close to 0, the pseudo-effective cone $\mathcal{E}_{X_0}$ of X_0 lies in a space which has a higher dimension than the ambient spaces of its counterparts $\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ on the nearby fibres.

We shall now define a complex vector subspace

$$H'^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{C}) \subset H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{C})$$

depending on the chosen family of Hermitian metrics $(\omega_t)_{t \in \Delta}$ such that:

- $\dim H'^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{C}) = \dim H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t, \mathbb{C})$ for all $t \in \Delta$ close to 0;
- $H'^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{C}) = H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0, \mathbb{C})$ when $h^{1,1}_{BC}(0) = h^{1,1}_{BC}(t)$ for t close to 0.

For every $t \in \Delta$, let $\Delta_{A,\,t} : C^\infty_{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t, \mathbb{C}) \to C^\infty_{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t, \mathbb{C})$ be the Aeppli Laplacian in bidegree $(n-1,\, n-1)$ defined by the Hermitian metric ω_t on X_t. Since $\Delta_{A,\,t}$ is a non-negative self-adjoint elliptic operator (of order 4), it has a discrete spectrum $0 \leq \lambda_1(t) \leq \lambda_2(t) \leq \ldots$ with $+\infty$ as sole accumulation point and the space $C^\infty_{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t, \mathbb{C})$ has an orthonormal basis $(e_j(t))_{j \geq 1}$ consisting of eigenvectors such that

$$\Delta_{A,\,t} e_j(t) = \lambda_j(t)\, e_j(t), \quad j \geq 1, t \in \Delta.$$

Let $N := h^{1,1}_{BC}(0)$ and $p := h^{1,1}_{BC}(t)$ for t close to 0. Thus $N \geq p$ by the Kodaira-Spencer upper-semicontinuity property [KS60, Theorem 4]. Let

$$0 < \varepsilon < \min\left(\operatorname{Spec}\Delta_{A,0} \cap (0,\, +\infty)\right) \quad \text{such that} \quad \varepsilon \notin \operatorname{Spec}\Delta_{A,t} \ \forall t \sim 0.$$

Then, thanks to fundamental Kodaira-Spencer theorems on smooth families of elliptic operators [KS60, Theorems 1-5], we have the following picture:

$0 = \lambda_1(0) = \cdots = \lambda_N(0) < \varepsilon < \lambda_{N+1}(0)$, while for all $t \sim 0, t \neq 0$, we have:
$0 = \lambda_1(t) = \cdots = \lambda_p(t) < \lambda_{p+1}(t) \leq \cdots \leq \lambda_N(t) < \varepsilon < \lambda_{N+1}(t)$,

i.e. the number of eigenvalues (counted with multiplicities) of $\Delta_{A,t}$ lying in the open interval $(-1,\, \varepsilon)$ is independent of t if $t \in \Delta$ is sufficiently close to 0. Moreover, if $E_{\Delta_{A,t}}(\lambda)$ denotes the eigenspace of $\Delta_{A,t}$ corresponding to the eigenvalue λ, the Kodaira-Spencer theorems further ensure that

$$\Delta \ni t \mapsto \bigoplus_{0 \leq \lambda < \varepsilon} E_{\Delta_{A,t}}(\lambda) := \mathcal{E}_{A,\varepsilon}^{n-1,\,n-1}(t)$$

is a C^∞ vector bundle of finite rank (equal to N here) after possibly shrinking Δ about 0 and that the orthogonal projections

$$C^\infty_{n-1,\,n-1}(X_t,\, \mathbb{C}) \xrightarrow{\sigma_t} \mathcal{E}_{A,\varepsilon}^{n-1,\,n-1}(t) \tag{17}$$

vary in a C^∞ way with $t \in \Delta$.
Thus $\{e_1(t), \ldots, e_N(t)\}$ is a local frame for the vector bundle $\mathcal{E}_{A,\varepsilon}^{n-1,\,n-1}$ and we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \ker\Delta_{A,0} &= \langle e_1(0), \ldots, e_p(0), \ldots, e_N(0)\rangle = \mathcal{E}_{A,\varepsilon}^{n-1,\,n-1}(0), \\ \ker\Delta_{A,t} &= \langle e_1(t), \ldots, e_p(t)\rangle \subset \langle e_1(t), \ldots, e_N(t)\rangle = \mathcal{E}_{A,\varepsilon}^{n-1,\,n-1}(t), \quad t \neq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have an orthogonal splitting

$$\ker\Delta_{A,0} = \langle e_1(0), \ldots, e_p(0)\rangle \oplus \langle e_{p+1}(0), \ldots, e_N(0)\rangle$$

which induces under the Hodge isomorphism $\ker\Delta_{A,0} \simeq H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})$ a splitting

$$H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) = H_A^{'n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) \oplus H_A^{''n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) \tag{18}$$

where $H_A^{'n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) \simeq \langle e_1(0), \ldots, e_p(0)\rangle$ and
$H_A^{''n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) \simeq \langle e_{p+1}(0), \ldots, e_N(0)\rangle$. Now, $H_{BC}^{1,1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})$ and $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})$ are dual to each other, so identifying $H_{BC}^{1,1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})$ with $H_A^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})^\star$ we define

$$H_{BC}^{'1,1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) := \left\{ [\alpha]_{BC} \in H_{BC}^{1,1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C}) \,/\, [\alpha]_{BC|H_A^{''n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})} = 0 \right\}. \tag{19}$$

Thus, $H^{'1,1}_{BC}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$ consists of the linear maps $[\alpha]_{BC}\,:\,H^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})\to\mathbb{C}$ vanishing on $H^{''n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$, i.e. identifies with the dual of $H^{'n-1,\,n-1}_{A}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$.

It is clear that $H^{'1,1}_{BC}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$ coincides with $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$ if $h^{1,1}_{BC}(0)=h^{1,1}_{BC}(t)$ for $t\sim 0$, but it depends on the choice of the C^∞ family of metrics $(\omega_t)_{t\in\Delta}$, so it is not canonical, if $h^{1,1}_{BC}(0)>h^{1,1}_{BC}(t)$. The same construction can, of course, be run for any $t_0\in\Delta$ in place of 0.

Definition 5.8 *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ be a holomorphic family of* **sGG** *compact complex manifolds equipped with a C^∞ family of Hermitian metrics $(\omega_t)_{t\in\Delta}$.*

For any $t_0\in\Delta$, the **limit as $t\to t_0$ of the pseudo-effective cones** $\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ *of the fibres X_t for $t\neq t_0$ is defined as the following subset of $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{R})$:*

$$\lim_{t\to t_0}\mathcal{E}_{X_t}:=\left\{[\alpha]_{BC}\in H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{R})\cap H^{'1,1}_{BC}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{C})\,/\,(Q^\star_{\omega_t}\circ P^\star_{t_0})([\alpha]_{BC})\in\mathcal{E}_{X_t}\ \forall t\sim t_0\right\},$$

where "$\forall t\sim t_0$" means "for all t sufficiently close to t_0".

Note that we restrict from the start to classes in the subspace $H^{'1,1}_{BC}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{C})\subset H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_{t_0},\,\mathbb{C})$ to trim off the extra dimensions that the limit may acquire if the dimension of $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t,\,\mathbb{C})$ increases in the limit. Note also that, unlike its Gauduchon-cone counterpart, $\lim\limits_{t\to t_0}\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ depends not only on the metric ω_{t_0} but on the whole family of metrics $(\omega_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ for $t\sim 0$.

We can now prove that the pseudo-effective cone $\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ behaves upper-semicontinuously in families of sGG manifolds.

Theorem 5.9 *Let $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ be any holomorphic family of* **sGG** *compact complex manifolds endowed with any C^∞ family $(\omega_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ of Hermitian metrics.*

Then, for all $t_0\in\Delta$, the following inclusion holds:

$$\mathcal{E}_{X_{t_0}}\supset\lim_{t\to t_0}\mathcal{E}_{X_t}.$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may suppose that $t_0=0$. Let $[T]_{BC}\in\lim\limits_{t\to 0}\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$, where T is a d-closed real $(1,\,1)$-current on X_0. (We implicitly use the fact that the Bott-Chern cohomology can be computed using either smooth forms or currents.) Since $\mathcal{E}_{X_t}$ is the dual of $\overline{\mathcal{G}_{X_t}}$ by Lamari's duality lemma, for all $t\neq 0$ with $t\sim 0$ and for any Gauduchon metric γ_t on X_t, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{X_t}(Q^\star_{\omega_t}\circ P^\star_0)([T]_{BC})\wedge[\gamma_t^{n-1}]_A &= \int\limits_{X_t}\{T\}_{DR}\wedge Q_{\omega_t}([\gamma_t^{n-1}]_A) \qquad (20)\\ &= \int\limits_{X_t}T\wedge(\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2}+\gamma_t^{n-1}+\overline{\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2}})\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the first identity in (20) is (16), while the second identity holds for the $(n,\, n-2)$-form $\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2}$ on X_t determined as described in Definition 5.3 by γ_t^{n-1} and the Hermitian metric ω_t of X_t.

We will show that $[T]_{BC} \in \mathcal{E}_{X_0}$. Since $\mathcal{E}_{X_0}$ is the dual of $\overline{\mathcal{G}_{X_0}}$ by Lamari's lemma, this amounts to showing that

$$\int\limits_{X_0} T \wedge \gamma_0^{n-1} \geq 0 \tag{21}$$

for any Gauduchon metric γ_0 on X_0.

Let us fix an arbitrary Gauduchon metric γ_0 on X_0. Pick any C^∞ deformation of γ_0 to Gauduchon metrics $(\gamma_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ on the fibres $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$. (This is always possible as the proof of Gauduchon's theorem shows – see e.g. [Pop13a, §.3]). Since $(\gamma_t^{n-1})_{t\in\Delta}$ is a C^∞ family of $(n-1,\, n-1)$-forms and since $(\sigma_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ is a C^∞ family of orthogonal projections (defined in (17)), $(\sigma_t\gamma_t^{n-1})_{t\in\Delta}$ is a C^∞ family of $(n-1,\, n-1)$-forms.

We use the notation of Definition 5.3 with $\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}$ replaced with γ_t^{n-1} on each fibre X_t. Thus $\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1}$ stands for the $\Delta_{A,\,t}$-harmonic component of γ_t^{n-1}, so for every $t \in \Delta$ we have:

$$\gamma_t^{n-1} = \Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1} + \partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1} + \bar\partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}},$$

$$\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n,\,n-2} := -\bar\partial_t^\star\,{''}\Delta_t^{-1}(\partial_t\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega_t^{n,\,n-2} := \Omega_{A,\,t}^{n,\,n-2} + \partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}}$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\sigma_0\gamma_0^{n-1} = \Omega_{A,\,0}^{n-1,\,n-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} c_j(0)\, e_j(0) + \sum_{j=p+1}^{N} c_j(0)\, e_j(0) := \Omega'_{A,\,0} + \Omega''_{A,\,0},$$

$$\sigma_t\gamma_t^{n-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} c_j(t)\, e_j(t) + \sum_{j=p+1}^{N} c_j(t)\, e_j(t) = \Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1} + \sum_{j=p+1}^{N} c_j(t)\, e_j(t),$$

for $t \sim 0, t \neq 0$. Thus $\Omega'_{A,\,0}, \Omega''_{A,\,0} \in \ker\Delta_{A,\,0}$ and $[\Omega'_{A,\,0}]_A \in {H_A^{'}}^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})$ while $[\Omega''_{A,\,0}]_A \in {H_A^{''}}^{n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\, \mathbb{C})$. The coefficients $c_j(t) \in \mathbb{C}$ vary continuously with $t \in \Delta$, so $c_j(t) \to c_j(0)$ as $t \to 0$ for every j. We get:

$$\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{p} c_j(t)\, e_j(t) \longrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^{p} c_j(0)\, e_j(0) = \Omega'_{A,\,0} \in \ker\Delta_{A,\,0} \quad \text{as } t \to 0, \tag{22}$$

hence, from ∂_t varying in a C^∞ way with t up to $t = 0$, we infer

$$\partial_t\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1} \longrightarrow \partial_0\Omega'_{A,\,0} \quad \text{as } t \to 0.$$

Now comes a crucial argument. The forms $\partial_t\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1}$ and $\partial_0\Omega'_{A,\,0}$ are of bidegree $(n,\, n-1)$ for their respective complex structures. On the other hand, by Serre duality we have $h_{\bar\partial}^{n,\,n-1}(t) = h_{\bar\partial}^{0,\,1}(t)$, hence part (ii) of our Corollary 1.6 and the sGG assumption ensure that

$$h^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(0) = h^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(t) \quad \text{for all } t \sim 0.$$

Therefore, the Green operators $(\Delta_t^{''-1})_{t\in\Delta}$ vary in a C^∞ way with t (up to $t = 0$) by the Kodaira-Spencer theorem [KS60, Theorem 5] which applies when the relevant Hodge numbers ($h^{n,\,n-1}_{\bar\partial}(t)$ here) do not jump. Thus,

$$\Delta_t^{''-1}(\partial_t\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A,\,t}) \longrightarrow \Delta_0^{''-1}(\partial_0\Omega'_{A,\,0}) \quad \text{as } t \to 0$$

and since $\bar\partial_t^\star$ varies in a C^∞ way with t up to $t = 0$, we infer

$$\Omega^{n,\,n-2}_{A,\,t} = -\bar\partial_t^\star\Delta_t^{''-1}(\partial_t\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A,\,t}) \longrightarrow -\bar\partial_0^\star\Delta_0^{''-1}(\partial_0\Omega'_{A,\,0}) := \Omega^{'n,\,n-2}_{A,\,0} \qquad (23)$$

as $t \to 0$. It is clear that the form $\Omega^{'n,\,n-2}_{A,\,0}$ is of bidegree $(n,\, n-2)$ on X_0.

We can now finish the proof of the theorem. Recall that we have to prove inequality (21). With the above preparations, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\gamma_0^{n-1} &= \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge(\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A,\,0} + \partial_0\Gamma_0^{n-2,\,n-1} + \bar\partial_0\overline{\Gamma_0^{n-2,\,n-1}}) \overset{(a)}{=} \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega^{n-1,\,n-1}_{A,\,0}\\ &= \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega'_{A,\,0} + \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega''_{A,\,0} \overset{(b)}{=} \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega'_{A,\,0}, \qquad (24)\end{aligned}$$

where identity (a) follows by Stokes' theorem from $\partial_0 T = 0$ and $\bar\partial_0 T = 0$ (due to $dT = 0$), while identity (b) follows from the definition of $H^{'1,\,1}_{BC}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$, from $[T]_{BC} \in H^{'1,\,1}_{BC}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$ and from $[\Omega''_{A,\,0}]_A \in H_A^{''n-1,\,n-1}(X_0,\,\mathbb{C})$.

On the other hand, the last integral in (20), which is non-negative for all $t \sim 0$ and $t \neq 0$, transforms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge(\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2} + \gamma_t^{n-1} + \overline{\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2}}) &= \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\gamma_t^{n-1} \qquad (25)\\ &+ \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\Omega^{n,\,n-2}_{A,\,t} + \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-1,\,n-2}\\ &+ \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\overline{\Omega^{n,\,n-2}_{A,\,t}} + \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\bar\partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Now, $\int_{X_t} T\wedge\gamma_t^{n-1}$ converges to $\int_{X_0} T\wedge\gamma_0^{n-1}$, while $\int_{X_t} T\wedge\Omega^{n,\,n-2}_{A,\,t}$ converges to $\int_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega^{'n,\,n-2}_{A,\,0} = 0$ by the crucial convergence (23). The last identity follows from T being of bidegree $(1,\,1)$ and $\Omega^{'n,\,n-2}_{A,\,0}$ being of bidegree $(n,\, n-2)$, hence $T\wedge\Omega^{'n,\,n-2}_{A,\,0} = 0$ as an $(n+1,\, n-1)$-current. By conjugation, we infer that $\int_{X_t} T\wedge\overline{\Omega^{n,\,n-2}_{A,\,t}}$ converges to $\int_{X_0} T\wedge\overline{\Omega^{'n,\,n-2}_{A,\,0}} = 0$. Furthermore, we have:

$$\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}} = \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge d\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}} - \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\bar\partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}} = -\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\bar\partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}},$$

the last identity following from Stokes' theorem and $dT = 0$. We also have the conjugate identity: $\int_{X_t} T\wedge\bar\partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1} = -\int_{X_t} T\wedge\partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}$, hence:

$$\begin{aligned}\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}} + \int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge\bar\partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1} &= -\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge(\bar\partial_t\overline{\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1}} + \partial_t\Gamma_t^{n-2,\,n-1})\\ &= -\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge(\gamma_t^{n-1} - \Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1}). \qquad (26)\end{aligned}$$

Now, $\int_{X_t} T\wedge\gamma_t^{n-1}$ converges to $\int_{X_0} T\wedge\gamma_0^{n-1}$ and, by (22), $\int_{X_t} T\wedge\Omega_{A,\,t}^{n-1,\,n-1}$ converges to $\int_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega'_{A,\,0}$ as $t\to 0$. Putting together (25), (26) and all the pieces of convergence information just mentioned, we get the convergence:

$$\int\limits_{X_t} T\wedge(\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2} + \gamma_t^{n-1} + \overline{\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2}}) \longrightarrow \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\Omega'_{A,\,0} = \int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\gamma_0^{n-1} \quad \text{as } t\to 0, \qquad (27)$$

where the last identity is nothing but (24).

Recall that $\int_{X_t} T\wedge(\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2} + \gamma_t^{n-1} + \overline{\Omega_t^{n,\,n-2}}) \geq 0$ for all $t\sim 0$ with $t\neq 0$ by (20). Hence (27) implies $\int\limits_{X_0} T\wedge\gamma_0^{n-1} \geq 0$ and we are done. □

6 Relations between the sGG class and other classes of compact complex manifolds

In this section we show that sGG manifolds are unrelated to balanced manifolds and to those whose Frölicher spectral sequence degenerates at E_1. Examples of compact complex manifolds X with $\mathcal{SG}_X \neq \mathcal{G}_X$ but admitting strongly Gauduchon metrics are also given. To construct appropriate examples we will consider the class of nilmanifolds endowed with an invariant complex structure.

Recall that a nilmanifold $N = G/\Gamma$ is a compact quotient of a connected and simply-connected nilpotent real Lie group G by a lattice Γ of maximal rank in G. Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be the Lie algebra of the group G. We will say that *"N has underlying Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$"* or that *"$\mathfrak{g}$ is the Lie algebra underlying N"*. We will denote 6-dimensional real Lie algebras in the usual abbreviated form; for instance, $(0^4, 12, 34)$ denotes the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ with generators $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^6$ satisfying the bracket relations $[e_1, e_2] = -e_5,\ [e_3, e_4] = -e_6$, or equivalently

there exists a basis $\{\alpha^i\}_{i=1}^6$ of the dual $\mathfrak{g}^*$ such that $d\alpha^1 = d\alpha^2 = d\alpha^3 = d\alpha^4 = 0,\ d\alpha^5 = \alpha^1 \wedge \alpha^2,\ d\alpha^6 = \alpha^3 \wedge \alpha^4$.

Notice that by Nomizu's theorem [Nom54], the integer k appearing in 0^k in the notation above is precisely the first Betti number of N, i.e. $b_1(N) = k$.

The complex structures that we will consider on N are invariant in the sense that they stem naturally from "complex" structures J on the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ of G. For any such J, the i-eigenspace $\mathfrak{g}_{1,0}$ of J in $\mathfrak{g}_{\mathbb{C}} = \mathfrak{g} \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} \mathbb{C}$ is a complex subalgebra. When $\mathfrak{g}_{1,0}$ is abelian we will refer to J as an *abelian* complex structure.

The following result identifies the compact complex nilmanifolds of complex dimension 3 that are sGG.

Theorem 6.1 *Let N be a nilmanifold of (real) dimension six not isomorphic to a torus and let J be an invariant complex structure on N. Then, the compact complex manifold $X = (N, J)$ is sGG if and only if the Lie algebra underlying N is isomorphic to $(0^4, 12, 34)$, $(0^4, 12, 14+23)$, $(0^4, 13+42, 14+23)$ or $(0^4, 12, 13)$ and the complex structure J is not abelian.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.5, if N admits an invariant complex structure J such that $X = (N, J)$ is sGG then the first Betti number is even. From the classification of nilpotent Lie algebras admitting a complex structure [Sal01], this condition implies that the Lie algebra underlying N belongs to the following list: $(0^4, 12, 34)$, $(0^4, 12, 14 + 23)$, $(0^4, 13 + 42, 14 + 23)$, $(0^4, 12, 13)$, $(0^4, 12, 14 + 25)$, $(0^2, 12, 13, 23, 14 + 25)$.

We first rule out the last two cases. It was proved in [UV14, Proposition 2.4] that for any invariant complex structure J on a nilmanifold N with underlying Lie algebra $(0^2, 12, 13, 23, 14+25)$ there is a global basis $\{\eta^1, \eta^2, \eta^3\}$ of forms of bidegree (1,0), with respect to J, satisfying complex equations of the shape:

$$d\eta^1 = 0, \quad d\eta^2 = \eta^{13} + \eta^{1\bar{3}}, \quad d\eta^3 = i\eta^{1\bar{1}} \pm i(\eta^{1\bar{2}} - \eta^{2\bar{1}}),$$

(where we use the standard notation: $\eta^{jk} := \eta^j \wedge \eta^k$, $\eta^{j\bar{k}} := \eta^j \wedge \overline{\eta^k}$.)
That is to say, up to equivalence there exist exactly two invariant complex structures on N depending on the choice of sign in the third equation. Hence, $H^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J) = \langle [\eta^{\bar{1}}]_{\bar{\partial}}, [\eta^{\bar{3}}]_{\bar{\partial}} \rangle$ by a result in [Rol09, Section 4.2], and we get $b_1(N) = 2 < 4 = 2h^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J)$. It follows from Theorem 1.5 that there is no invariant complex structure on N satisfying the sGG property.

By [COUV11], for any invariant complex structure J on a nilmanifold N with underlying Lie algebra $(0^4, 12, 14+25)$ there is a global basis $\{\eta^1, \eta^2, \eta^3\}$ of (1,0)-forms satisfying

$$d\eta^1 = 0, \quad d\eta^2 = \eta^{1\bar{1}}, \quad d\eta^3 = \eta^{1\bar{2}} + \eta^{2\bar{1}},$$

which implies that $h^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J) = 3$. Therefore, $b_1(N) = 4 < 6 = 2h^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J)$, so there is no invariant complex structure on N satisfying the sGG property.

It is well known that on 6-dimensional nilmanifolds different from the complex tori there exists (up to equivalence) only one complex-parallelisable complex structure given by the complex equations

$$d\eta^1 = d\eta^2 = 0, \quad d\eta^3 = \eta^{12}.$$

This corresponds to the Iwasawa manifold (which is an sGG manifold by e.g. Corollary 1.4) whose underlying Lie algebra is precisely $(0^4, 13+42, 14+23)$. Now, for any other complex structure J on a nilmanifold N with underlying Lie algebra $(0^4, 12, 34)$, $(0^4, 12, 14+23)$, $(0^4, 13+42, 14+23)$ or $(0^4, 12, 13)$, it is proved in [COUV11] that there is a (1,0)-basis satisfying

$$d\eta^1 = d\eta^2 = 0, \quad d\eta^3 = \rho\, \eta^{12} + \eta^{1\bar{1}} + \lambda\, \eta^{1\bar{2}} + D\, \eta^{2\bar{2}}, \tag{28}$$

where $\rho \in \{0, 1\}$, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and $D = x + iy \in \mathbb{C}$ with $y \geq 0$. Notice that J is abelian if and only if $\rho = 0$.

To complete the proof we must show that for any complex structure J given by (28) the compact complex manifold (N, J) satisfies $b_1(N) = 4 = 2h^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J)$ if and only if $\rho = 1$. But this is clear because $H^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J) = \langle [\eta^{\bar{1}}]_{\bar{\partial}}, [\eta^{\bar{2}}]_{\bar{\partial}}, [\eta^{\bar{3}}]_{\bar{\partial}} \rangle$ when $\rho = 0$, and $H^{0,1}_{\bar{\partial}}(N, J) = \langle [\eta^{\bar{1}}]_{\bar{\partial}}, [\eta^{\bar{2}}]_{\bar{\partial}} \rangle$ for $\rho = 1$. □

For any compact complex manifold X, it is immediate that if X is sGG then X has an sG metric. The following example shows that the converse does not hold in general even if the sG hypothesis is reinforced to the balanced hypothesis and even with an extra property.

Proposition 6.2 *There exists a compact complex manifold X having a balanced metric, with Frölicher spectral sequence degenerating at the first step and with first Betti number $b_1(X)$ odd. Thus, X is not sGG.*

Proof. Let N be a nilmanifold with underlying Lie algebra isomorphic to $(0^5, 12+34)$. Then, the first Betti number of N is 5. We consider on N the complex structure J defined by the complex equations

$$d\eta^1 = d\eta^2 = 0, \quad d\eta^3 = \eta^{1\bar{1}} - \eta^{2\bar{2}}.$$

By Theorem 1.5 we know that $X = (N, J)$ is not sGG because $b_1(N) = 5$. It is proved in [COUV11] that $E_1(X) \cong E_\infty(X)$. Moreover, X is balanced; for instance, $\omega = \frac{i}{2}(\eta^{1\bar{1}} + \eta^{2\bar{2}} + \eta^{3\bar{3}})$ satisfies $d\omega^2 = 0$, that is, ω is a balanced metric on X. □

Proposition 6.3 *The balanced property and the sGG property are unrelated. Moreover, the Frölicher spectral sequence degenerating at E_1 and the sGG property are also unrelated.*

Proof. In Proposition 6.2 we proved that "balanced" does not imply "sGG", and that $E_1(X) \cong E_\infty(X)$ does not imply X to be sGG. We now show that there exists an sGG compact complex manifold X that is not balanced and whose Frölicher spectral sequence does not degenerate at E_1.

Let N be a nilmanifold with underlying Lie algebra isomorphic to $(0^4, 13+42, 14+23)$, that is, N is the (real) manifold underlying the Iwasawa manifold. We consider on N the complex structure J defined by the complex equations

$$d\eta^1 = d\eta^2 = 0, \quad d\eta^3 = \eta^{12} + \eta^{1\bar{1}}. \tag{29}$$

By Theorem 6.1 the compact complex manifold $X = (N, J)$ is sGG because the complex structure J is not abelian. However, from the general study in [COUV11] one has that $E_1(X) \ncong E_2(X) \cong E_\infty(X)$ and X does not admit any balanced metric. □

We are now ready to give another example promised in the introduction.

Proposition 6.4 *The superstrong Gauduchon property and the sGG property are unrelated.*

Proof. Let us show first that there exists an sGG compact complex manifold X that does not admit any superstrong Gauduchon metric. Consider $X = (N, J)$ a (real) $2n$-dimensional nilmanifold N endowed with an invariant complex structure J. By the usual symmetrisation process, if ω is a superstrong Gauduchon metric on X, then there also exists an invariant superstrong Gauduchon metric $\hat{\omega}$ on X. Indeed, if $\Omega = \omega^{n-1}$ satisfies $\partial\Omega = \partial\bar{\partial}\alpha$ for some $(n-1, n-2)$-form α, then by symmetrisation we get that the positive definite invariant $(n-1, n-1)$-form $\widetilde{\Omega}$ (obtained from Ω) satisfies $\partial\widetilde{\Omega} = \partial\bar{\partial}\tilde{\alpha}$ for an invariant $(n-1, n-2)$-form $\tilde{\alpha}$. Now, since $\widetilde{\Omega} > 0$, it is well known that there exists an invariant Hermitian metric $\hat{\omega}$ such that $\widetilde{\Omega} = \hat{\omega}^{n-1}$. Thus $\hat{\omega}$ is necessarily an invariant superstrong Gauduchon metric on X.

Now, let us consider $X = (N, J)$ defined by (29), which by Theorem 6.1 is sGG. A direct calculation shows that $\partial\bar{\partial}\Lambda^{2,1}(\mathfrak{g}^*) \equiv 0$. Therefore, if a superstrong Gauduchon metric existed on X, it would have to be an invariant balanced metric. However, we pointed out in the proof of Proposition 6.3 that X is not balanced. Thus, X is sGG but does not admit any superstrong Gauduchon metric.

Conversely, we notice that the superstrong Gauduchon property does not imply the sGG property because, thanks to Proposition 6.2, there exists a balanced manifold which is not sGG. □

7 Examples of deformation limits of sGG manifolds

The following result shows that the sGG hypothesis on X does not ensure the Bott-Chern number $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X)$ to be locally deformation constant.

Proposition 7.1 *There exists a holomorphic family of compact complex* **sGG** *manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ such that $h^{1,1}_{BC}(0) > h^{1,1}_{BC}(t)$ for all $t \in \Delta^\star\setminus C$, where $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a small open disc about 0 and C is a real curve contained in Δ.*

Proof. Let $X_0 = (N, J_0)$ be a complex nilmanifold of real dimension 6 defined by the equations

$$d\eta^1 = d\eta^2 = 0, \quad d\eta^3 = \eta^{12} + \eta^{1\bar 1} + \eta^{1\bar 2} - 2\,\eta^{2\bar 2}. \tag{30}$$

By [COUV11, Table 1] the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ underlying N is isomorphic to $(0^4, 12, 14+23)$. Since the complex structure J_0 is not abelian, Theorem 6.1 implies that X_0 is sGG.

By [Ang11, Theorem 2.7], the Bott-Chern cohomology groups of X_0 can be calculated at the level of the Lie algebra underlying N, in particular, $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0) \cong H^{1,1}_{BC}(\mathfrak{g}, J_0) = \ker\{d\colon \Lambda^{1,1}(\mathfrak{g}^*) \longrightarrow \Lambda^3(\mathfrak{g}^*_{\mathbb{C}})\}$. From the equations (30) we get

$$H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0) \cong \langle [\eta^{1\bar 1}]_{BC}, [\eta^{1\bar 2}]_{BC}, [\eta^{2\bar 1}]_{BC}, [\eta^{2\bar 2}]_{BC}, [\eta^{1\bar 3} + 2\,\eta^{2\bar 3} + \eta^{3\bar 1} + 2\,\eta^{3\bar 2}]_{BC}\rangle,$$

therefore $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X_0) = 5$.

Now we consider a small deformation J_t given by

$$t\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} \otimes d\bar z_2 \in H^{0,1}(X_0,\, T^{1,0}X_0),$$

where z_2 is a complex coordinate such that $\eta^2 = dz_2$. By Corollary 1.6 we know that the compact complex manifold $X_t = (N, J_t)$ is sGG for all $t \in \mathbb{C}$ close enough to 0. In fact, for $t \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|t| < 1$, if we consider the basis $\{\nu^1_t = \eta^1, \nu^2_t = \frac{1-\bar t}{1-|t|^2}(\eta^2 + t\,\eta^{\bar 2}), \nu^3_t = \eta^3\}$ of complex forms of type (1,0) with respect to J_t, then the complex structure equations along the deformation are :

$$d\nu^1_t = d\nu^2_t = 0, \quad d\nu^3_t = \nu^{12}_t + \nu^{1\bar 1}_t + \nu^{1\bar 2}_t - 2\,\frac{1-|t|^2}{|1-t|^2}\,\nu^{2\bar 2}_t. \tag{31}$$

Next we compute the dimension of the Bott-Chern cohomology group $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t)$ of X_t. Since the complex structure J_t is invariant, we can use again [Ang11, Theorem 2.7] to reduce the calculation to the invariant forms. By (31) it is clear that $\nu^{1\bar 1}_t$, $\nu^{1\bar 2}_t$, $\nu^{2\bar 1}_t$ and $\nu^{2\bar 2}_t$ define Bott-Chern classes in $H^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t)$. To see if there are some other classes, we need to compute the differentials of the remaining basic (1,1)-forms $\nu^{j\bar k}_t$. From the equations (31) we get :

$$d\nu_t^{1\bar 3} = \nu_t^{12\bar 1} - 2\,\tfrac{1-|t|^2}{|1-t|^2}\nu_t^{12\bar 2} - \nu_t^{1\bar 1\bar 2},$$

$$d\nu_t^{2\bar 3} = -\nu_t^{12\bar 1} - \nu_t^{2\bar 1\bar 2},$$

$$d\nu_t^{3\bar 1} = \nu_t^{12\bar 1} - \nu_t^{1\bar 1\bar 2} + 2\,\tfrac{1-|t|^2}{|1-t|^2}\nu_t^{2\bar 1\bar 2},$$

$$d\nu_t^{3\bar 2} = \nu_t^{12\bar 2} + \nu_t^{1\bar 1\bar 2},$$

$$d\nu_t^{3\bar 3} = \nu_t^{12\bar 3} - \nu_t^{13\bar 1} - \nu_t^{23\bar 1} + 2\,\tfrac{1-|t|^2}{|1-t|^2}\nu_t^{23\bar 2} + \nu_t^{1\bar 1\bar 3} + \nu_t^{1\bar 2\bar 3} - 2\,\tfrac{1-|t|^2}{|1-t|^2}\nu_t^{2\bar 2\bar 3} - \nu_t^{3\bar 1\bar 2}.$$

From these expressions, it is easy to check that there exists at most one more closed (1,1)-form, and that such a form exists if and only if $1-|t|^2 = |1-t|^2$.

Let $C = \{t \in \mathbb{C} \mid |t|^2 + |1-t|^2 = 1\}$. Note that C is a circumference centered at $t = 1/2$ passing through $t = 0$. Our discussion above shows that $h^{1,1}_{BC}(X_t) = 4$ for all $t \in \Delta^\star \setminus C$, where $\Delta = \{t \in \mathbb{C} \mid |t| < 1\} \subset \mathbb{C}$, that is, the Bott-Chern number $h^{1,1}_{BC}$ is not locally deformation constant. □

In the following result we show by means of three examples that the sGG property of compact complex manifolds is not closed under holomorphic deformations. The behaviour of the holomorphic families in the three examples is different and illustrate several possibilities for the central limit.

Proposition 7.2 *There exist holomorphic families of compact complex manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ over an open disc $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ about 0 such that X_t is sGG for all $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$, but X_0 is not sGG.*

Proof. We will describe three examples in succession.
First example. Let us consider the compact complex manifold $X_0 = (N, J_0)$, where N is the nilmanifold with underlying Lie algebra $(0^4, 13+42, 14+23)$ and J_0 is the abelian structure defined by the complex structure equations

$$d\eta^1 = d\eta^2 = 0, \quad d\eta^3 = \eta^{1\bar 1} + \eta^{1\bar 2}.$$

Since J_0 is abelian, the manifold X_0 is not sGG (by Theorem 6.1), and $H^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X_0, \mathbb{C}) = \langle [\eta^{\bar 1}]_{\bar\partial}, [\eta^{\bar 2}]_{\bar\partial}, [\eta^{\bar 3}]_{\bar\partial}\rangle$. Consider a small deformation J_t given by

$$t\frac{\partial}{\partial z_2} \otimes d\bar z_2 \in H^{0,1}(X_0,\, T^{1,0}X_0),$$

where z_2 is a complex coordinate such that $\eta^2 = dz_2$. Let us consider the basis $\{\tau_t^1 = \eta^1, \tau_t^2 = \eta^2 + t\,\eta^{\bar 2}, \tau_t^3 = \eta^3\}$ of complex forms of type (1,0) with respect to J_t. Then, for $t \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|t| < 1$, the complex structure equations of the deformation are :

$$d\tau_t^1 = d\tau_t^2 = 0, \quad d\tau_t^3 = -\frac{\bar t}{1-|t|^2}\,\tau_t^{12} + \tau_t^{1\bar 1} + \frac{1}{1-|t|^2}\,\tau_t^{1\bar 2}.$$

For any $t \neq 0$, the complex structure is not abelian because the differential of the (1,0)-form τ_t^3 has a non-zero component of bidegree (2,0), so the compact complex manifold $X_t = (N, J_t)$ is sGG for any $t \neq 0$ by Theorem 6.1.

Note that X_0 admits a balanced metric by [COUV11, Proposition 7.7], hence also an sG metric, so $\mathcal{SG}_{X_0} \neq \emptyset$.

Second example. In [COUV11, Theorem 7.9] it is constructed a holomorphic family of compact complex (nil)manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ over an open disc $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ about 0, where X_t is balanced for any $t \neq 0$ and such that the central limit X_0 is a complex nilmanifold with underlying Lie algebra $(0^4, 12, 14 + 23)$ endowed with an abelian complex structure J_0. The complex structure on X_t is invariant and non-abelian for any $t \neq 0$, so by Theorem 6.1 the compact complex manifold X_t is sGG, but the central limit X_0 is not sGG. Moreover, it is proved in [COUV11, Proposition 7.7] that X_0 is not sG, so $\mathcal{SG}_{X_0} = \emptyset$.

Third example. Angella and Kasuya obtain in [AK14, Proposition 4.1 (i)] a holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds X_t over an open disc in $\mathbb{C}$ about 0, satisfying the $\partial\bar\partial$-lemma for any $t \neq 0$ and such that the central limit X_0 is the complex-parallelisable Nakamura manifold [Nak75]. By Theorem 1.5 we conclude that X_0 is not sGG because $b_1(X_0) = 2 < 6 = 2h^{0,1}_{\bar\partial}(X_0)$ (see [AK14, Table 10]). Note however that the central limit X_0 is balanced. □

In [Pop09, Proposition 4.1] it is proved that given a holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ over an open disc $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ about 0, if X_t satisfies the $\partial\bar\partial$-lemma for all $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$ then X_0 is sG. However, the central limit X_0 may be neither sGG (see *Third example* in the proof of Proposition 7.2) nor balanced (see [FOU14, Theorem 5.2]). Furthermore, in the following proposition we show that in general X_0 does not admit superstrong Gauduchon metrics.

Proposition 7.3 *There exists a holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ over an open disc $\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}$ about 0 such that X_t satisfies the $\partial\bar\partial$-lemma for all $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$, but X_0 is not superstrong Gauduchon.*

Proof. We consider the holomorphic family of compact complex manifolds $(X_t)_{t\in\Delta}$ constructed in [FOU14, Theorem 5.2], which satisfies the $\partial\bar\partial$-lemma for all $t \in \Delta \setminus \{0\}$. The central limit of that family is $X_0 = (G/\Gamma, J_0)$, where G/Γ is a solvmanifold (i.e. a compact quotient of a connected and simply-connected *solvable* real Lie group G by a lattice Γ of maximal rank in G) and J_0 is the invariant complex structure defined by the complex structure equations

$$d\eta^1 = 2i\,\eta^{13} + \eta^{3\bar3}, \quad d\eta^2 = -2i\,\eta^{23}, \quad d\eta^3 = 0,$$

where $\{\eta^1, \eta^2, \eta^3\}$ is a (1,0)-basis. Thus, we can apply the symmetrisation process and proceed as in the proof of Proposition 6.4. So it suffices to show

that there do not exist superstrong Gauduchon metrics on the underlying solvable Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. From the complex structure equations above, it is easy to check that $\partial\bar{\partial}\Lambda^{2,1}(\mathfrak{g}^*) \equiv 0$, which implies that any invariant superstrong Gauduchon metric must be balanced. But this is not possible by [FOU14, Theorem 5.2], so we conclude that X_0 is not superstrong Gauduchon. (However, X_0 is sG as pointed out in [FOU14].) □

Acknowledgments. This work has been partially supported through Project MICINN (Spain) MTM2011-28326-C02-01.

References

[Ang11] D. Angella — *The Cohomologies of the Iwasawa Manifold and of Its Small Deformations* — J. Geom. Anal. (2011) DOI : 10.1007/s12220-011-9291-z.

[ADT14] D. Angella, G. Dloussky, A. Tomassini — *On Bott-Chern Cohomology of Compact Complex Surfaces* — arXiv e-print DG 1402.2408v1

[AK14] D. Angella, H. Kasuya, — *Cohomologies of deformations of solvmanifolds and closedness of some properties* — arXiv e-print CV 1305.6709v1

[Buc99] N. Buchdahl — *On Compact Kähler Surfaces* — Ann. Inst. Fourier **49**, no. 1 (1999) 287-302.

[COUV11] M. Ceballos, A. Otal, L. Ugarte, R. Villacampa — *Classification of complex structures on 6-dimensional nilpotent Lie algebras* — arXiv e-print DG 1111.5873v4

[Dem92] J.-P. Demailly — *Regularization of Closed Positive Currents and Intersection Theory* — J. Alg. Geom., **1** (1992), 361-409.

[DP04] J.-P. Demailly, M. Paun — *Numerical Charaterization of the Kähler Cone of a Compact Kähler Manifold* — Ann. Math. (2) **159(3)** (2004) 1247-1274.

[FOU14] A. Fino, A. Otal, L. Ugarte — *Six Dimensional Solvmanifolds with Holomorphically Trivial Canonical Bundle* — arXiv e-print DG 1401.0512v2

[KS60] K. Kodaira, D.C. Spencer — *On Deformations of Complex Analytic Structures, III. Stability Theorems for Complex Structures* — Ann. Math. **71**, No. 1 (1960), 43-76.

[Lam99] A. Lamari — *Courants kählériens et surfaces compactes* — Ann. Inst. Fourier, Grenoble, **49**, 1 (1999), 263-285.

[Miy74] Y. Miyaoka — *Kähler Metrics on Elliptic Surfaces* — Proc. Japan Acad. **50** No. 8 (1974) 533-536.

[Nak75] I. Nakamura — *Complex Parallelisable Manifolds and Their Small Deformations* — J. Diff. Geom. **10** (1975), 85-112.

[Nom54] K. Nomizu — *On the cohomology of compact homogeneous spaces of nilpotent Lie groups*— Ann. Math. **59** (1954), 531-538.

[Pop09] D. Popovici — *Limits of projective manifolds under holomorphic deformations* — arXiv e-print AG 0910.2032v1

[Pop13a] D. Popovici — *Deformation Limits of Projective Manifolds: Hodge Numbers and Strongly Gauduchon Metrics* — Invent. Math. **194** (2013), 515-534.

[Pop13b] D. Popovici — *Aeppli Cohomology Classes Associated with Gauduchon Metrics on Compact Complex Manifolds* — arXiv e-print DG 1310.3685v1

[Rol09] S. Rollenske — *Geometry of nilmanifolds with left-invariant complex structure and deformations in the large* — Proc. London Math. Soc. **99** (2009), 425-460.

[Sal01] S. Salamon — *Complex structures on nilpotent Lie algebras* — J. Pure Appl. Algebra **157** (2001), 311-333.

[Siu83] Y.-T. Siu — *Every K3 Surface Is Kähler* — Invent. Math. **73** (1983) 139-150.

[UV14] L. Ugarte, R. Villacampa — *Non-nilpotent complex geometry of nilmanifolds and heterotic supersymmetry* — Asian J. Math. **18** (2014), 229-246.

Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Université Paul Sabatier,
118 route de Narbonne, 31062 Toulouse, France
Email : popovici@math.univ-toulouse.fr

and

Departamento de Matemáticas - I.U.M.A., Universidad de Zaragoza,
Campus Plaza San Francisco, 50009 Zaragoza, Spain
Email : ugarte@unizar.es